

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW

FOR
APRIL—JUNE, 1949
JULY—SEPTEMBER, 1949

VOLUME CXLVIII.

THE CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW
39, WELBECK STREET.
LONDON, W.1.
1949.

CONTENTS

VALENTINUS AND THE ARIAN CHRIST. By H. A. Blair . . .	1
ELIZABETH BURNET, 1661-1709. By C. Kirchberger . . .	17
MIRACLE, RELATIVITY AND NATURAL LAW. By H. O. Jenkins . .	52
THE CHARACTER OF AN OLD ENGLISH PURITANE, OR NONCON- FORMIST—JOHN GERE. Edited by Maurice Hussey . . .	65
AN ENGLISH CATHEDRAL LIBRARY IN THE 17TH CENTURY. By Wilhelm Schenk	72
GIRALDUS CAMBRENSIS AND THE PRIMACY OF CANTERBURY. By I. P. Shaw	82
THE MOSCOW RESOLUTION ON ANGLICAN ORDERS, 1948. From a Correspondent	102
REVIEWS	125
PERIODICALS	146
BOOKS RECEIVED	150
MATTHEW ARNOLD ON MILTON. By E. M. W. Tillyard . . .	153
ARCHBISHOP WINCHELSEY: FROM HIS ELECTION TO HIS EN- THRONEMENT. By Rose Graham	161
THE IMPRESS OF THE HOLY TRINITY. By the Bishop of South- ampton	176
BERAKAH AND EUCHARISTIA. By R. D. Richardson . . .	194
THE GRACE OF HUMILITY. By F. P. Harton	221
THE ARMINIAN NUNNERY (1641). Edited by Maurice Hussey . .	229
THE IMMINENCE OF THE PAROUSIA. By Frederick A. M. Spencer .	237
CO-OPERATION BETWEEN THE MEDICAL PROFESSION AND THE CHURCHES. By A. Graham Ikin	249
REVIEWS	258
PERIODICALS	281
BOOKS RECEIVED	286
INDEX	291

#295-

VALENTINUS AND THE ARIAN CHRIST

By H. A. BLAIR

MODERNISM was not born in the last hundred years, nor was it then for the first time that Christianity and Science made an uneasy compromise. To-day Christianity has its doctrines which the scientifically minded find difficult—miracles, the Resurrection, the Virgin Birth—and there are those who are anxious to make it as easy as possible for them, by explaining away miracles, by reducing the Risen Christ to a ghost or a mirage, and by discounting the birth-narratives altogether.

The difficulties for educated Christians of the early second century were different: the two most serious were the authority of the Old Testament, and the Second Coming of Christ—with Christian eschatology in general. The first was mixed up with the problem of evil, and the contrast between the Wrath of Jehovah and the Love of Christ. The second difficulty was not only the unanswered question why Christ had not come, but also the picture language of Millenarianism: cultured folk were over-fastidious—they wanted something refined and “spiritual”—heaven and hell were really such vulgar ideas—the whole Christian Gospel needed an intellectual framework.

Valentinus and his predecessor, Basilides, were two constructive thinkers who tried to give Christianity just that intellectual framework which they felt it needed. I shall try to show that Valentinus was concerned not merely to build up a system of philosophy with some Christian elements in it, but to build upon a genuine foundation of tradition a system worthy of the cultured. He tried to reconcile Christianity, Greek

philosophy, and contemporary science, like many Modernists to-day. He was anxious to keep intact as much as possible of the Christian tradition, including the Old Testament: he saw that the New Testament grew out of the Old; and if he adopted the Alexandrian method of allegorizing, he was neither the first nor the most flagrant offender.

Like most great thinkers, he would be concerned to integrate the various aspects of truth, and not merely effect a compromise. We should expect his system, therefore, to contain a good deal of his own thought, extraneous to the *Corpus Christianum* and compatible with the Platonism and Science of Alexandria: but we should also expect to find the Christian tradition within it: there might be omissions, but in a man of Valentinus' calibre there would not be cheap credulity; he would not be ready to accept apocryphal embroidery or perversion, as is evident from his rejection of so much of the earlier Gnostic systems. His purpose was to explain the true nature of the "salvation attained mysteriously by Christians, in terms of current enlightened ideas" (Burkitt, *The Church and Gnosis*, p.21).

He would have no need to explain away miracles, or in any sense to rationalize the supernatural. Belief in the supernatural was no difficulty to the enlightened of his day. Miracles and magic were part of the accomplishments of the educated. Daemons, helpful and hindering, were accepted by most philosophers. Dr. Burkitt has given good reason to suppose that Valentinus was not superstitious by the standards of his age; and that his system was an allegorized philosophy, based on the Christian myth.

The writings of a Modernist Churchman of to-day would provide some material for the archaeologist of 2,000 years hence, if he were trying to reconstruct the Christianity of the twentieth century: and if he knew our present scientific background, he would be able to soak the artificial colouring out of the uncoloured original tradition.

(I) THE SYSTEM OF VALENTINUS, FROM THE HERESIOLOGISTS.

Valentinus was in no way hostile to the Church, but was, Tertullian says, hopeful of becoming Bishop of Rome (adv. Val. IV). His system, therefore, should tell us much about the Christian tradition of the second century at Alexandria and perhaps elsewhere: but the colouring of contemporary philosophy and science must be soaked out first.

The system was philosophically sound; none the less it foreshadows the Arian Christ, and explains the flight of the Angels from the writings of many of the Western Fathers. It was the perversion of the system by his followers which most frightened the Church: perversion by opponents was to be expected but who can save a heresiarch from his own disciples? (Tertullian says that the Valentinians had "departed from their founder": adv. Val. IV.)

Irenaeus gives us the system of Ptolemaeus; and Hippolytus evidently does not give us Valentinus' own system, for after referring to what Valentinus himself taught he continues in a strain which suggests the elaborate details of followers (Philosoph: VI, 30): probably some of his material came from Heracleon and some from Axionicus of Antioch. The other heresiologists derive most of their information indirectly through Irenaeus and Hippolytus. From these two sources therefore (Iren. contr. Haer. Bk. I, and Hippol. Philosoph. *passim*) we should be able to reconstruct something like the original system.

The Supreme Being, if that can be called a Being which cannot be said to exist except in the form of Light, thought. His thoughts were to himself an object of thought: in a Being of such rarefied personality every thought became a person: in a Being of such Creativeness every thought became itself creative, for Creativeness is of the essence of the Absolute: in a Being who is pure Love, the coexistence of personal objects of that love is a logical necessity. Hence, through Love and Reflection, Mind was born from the Silence of the Incomprehensible, wedded indissolubly to Truth.

Mind (the Maker, of the Hermetists), the only begotten,

the Father, the Beginning, is the only conceivable God. From Mind and Truth came the Word and Life—God as expressed to ear and eye. From the Word and Life came the Idea of Man (World Soul, Adam Kadmon, the Social Being) and *Ecclesia*. (In all these pairs, the second expresses the essential quality of its partner.)

By Mind and Truth were conceived in pairs the qualities which alone are the expression of God—Incomprehensible Mingling, Ageless Unity, Self-existent Happiness, Immovable Blending, Unique Blessedness. By the Word of Life were uttered predicates of Man as he was to be—Sustaining Faith, Paternal Providence (*ἐλπις*), Motherly Love, Everthoughtful Understanding, Comradeship in Happiness (*Ecclesiastikos Makariotes*), Permissible Wisdom.

No one of these qualities, who as personal Beings minister to God's glory, could exist without its counterpart; and the breaking of unity began when the restraint implied in the names of the last pair of Beings was too much for Ideal Man, and his Wisdom stretched out too far in an attempt to comprehend the Incomprehensible.

The Fullness of God to which Ideal Man belonged was not all-powerful: God could not contradict himself. From the depths of God's own Being there proceeded the Law which might not be transgressed: and this personified Law was converted from Horos, the Rule of Logic, to Stauros, the Law of Suffering, when transgression was attempted: for an attempt to transgress the untransgressible results in frustration, perplexity, fear, before there can come the path of return. Horos was the Law, who carried within himself Stauros the penalty, or boundary which had now been crossed, and which therefore involved suffering.

Hippolytus maintained that Valentinus was a Pythagorean under the cloak of Christianity: if we knew only what the heresiologists have told us we might believe him. But we know more.

(2) SYSTEM OF VALENTINUS, FILLED OUT FROM THE PISTIS SOPHIA. (*vide* Horner's literal translation from the Coptic Askew MS.)

In the first two documents of the Pistis Sophia we find Valentinus speaking for himself. Great scholars such as Dr. Burkitt have not accepted this view: he, Kostlin, Schmidt, and Harnack have held the view that the fourth document was the oldest. But Legge in his introduction to Horner's translation has pointed out that the earlier documents are likely to be the least magical: and without necessarily accepting all his views, he gives very convincing grounds for believing that much of the first two documents is from the hand of Valentinus himself. Some eminent scholars have refused to believe this, because they feel that a work so pedestrian and dull could not have come from the hand of a Valentinus acknowledged by his opponents as brilliant: it is full of repetition and the jargon of theosophy: but to condemn it on those grounds is to judge it on its manner of presentation: we are not Easterns, and its actual matter is not to be despised, as I shall try to show, but is worthy of Valentinus. We know that his writings did nauseate the Western fathers of his day and later, but not (for instance) his fellow countryman Clement of Alexandria—who disagreed but did not despise. I shall therefore accept Legge's view that the system and much of the material of the first two documents comes from Valentinus, and see whether it makes good theosophical sense.

This work deals with the Divine from the human end; and we find references which imply an earlier Fall than that of Sophia, and no such Fall is mentioned by the heresiologists. We must remember that they were attacking the systems of his disciples forty or more years after Valentinus produced his system. The systems of Ptolemy, Heracleon and Axionicus are well-balanced, and record the emergence of matter and evil from the misuse of speculative research: the Fall of Sophia is the Ideal Fall, and the Fall of Achamoth the actual one—there is no earlier Fall. But Valentinus in the Pistis Sophia knew of

a Fall in a higher sphere: the fall of Sophia was only the opportunity for an already rebellious "Triple Power" to lead her astray: this Triple Power was superior to Sophia, and was the Ruler of the Thirteenth Aeon (p. 23, 42b). He, like Sophia, had fallen from the Pleroma: rather tantalizingly, we get no complete account of his fall. But other differences between the Pistis Sophia and the later systems shed some light on it.

The Pleroma (as described by Irenaeus and Hippolytus) consisted of three waves of Aeons, the Ogdoad, the Decad, and the Dodecad—thirty in all—increased to thirty-four by the emergence of Horos-Stauros, Christus, the Holy Spirit, and Jesus. But in the Pistis Sophia, Sophia and her partner made up the last pair of twelve pairs of emanations: a casual reference by Hippolytus to Sophia as "the youngest of the twenty-four Aeons" shows that he had read Valentinus' own work, although he quotes his disciples (Hippol. Philos. VI, 29, 30). But the Pistis Sophia clearly does not regard the first three procreating pairs as emanations: they are the three Triple Powers. The twelve pairs of emanations are then the Decad, emanating from Mind with Truth, and the Dodecad from Word with Life (Hippolytus supports this, probably from Axionicus; Irenaeus, quoting from Ptolemy, has abandoned this). The third Triple Power was rebellious, and his rebellion caused the emergence of Horos-Stauros, who as the boundary-emanation between the Aeons and the Propator, makes a twelfth pair with the Decad and Dodecad. He was, however, older than Sophia, whose desire he rejected: she thus becomes the youngest of twenty-four Aeons (P.S. p. 22, 41b).

The "great Triple Power Self-willed, who is the third Triple Powered" (P.S. p. 23, 42b) is then Anthropos, either separated from or fallen with his partner Ekklesia: he is also known as "the great Adamas the tyrant." The first Adam in the heavenly places became self-willed instead of thinking about God and others: he ceased to allow his procreative light to pour out whole-heartedly because he was afraid of losing his power ("this who was disobedient having not emanated

all the purgation of his power which is in him: wishing to be Lord over all the Thirteenth Aeon with those who became below it"). He preferred to lord it outside the Pleroma rather than be a channel of Divine Influence within it. He was therefore shut out of the Pleroma with the system he had created. In his place as Triple Power came Christus and the Holy Spirit. This was the fall of the Angel called Man, and the origin of the Thirteenth Aeon or Kenoma.

The Self-willed designed his kingdom on the heavenly pattern: the highest heaven was that of Barbelo (Burkitt ingeniously suggests a derivation from the Coptic word for seed, "*belbile*", of which root there are traces in many African dialects: this would then be the seed of the material Universe). After that came the "deacons of the middle": then came the Twelve Rulers of the Aeons or Sphere which controls destiny. The Angel ministrants who actually formed man, unconsciously made him in the image of Ideal Man, and were terrified at their own work (Clem. Alex. Strom. II, 8): they therefore marred it as soon as possible. Hence the earthly fall.

Meanwhile another of the Aeons within the Pleroma began to go astray in the opposite direction: and Sophia's search for absorption in the Infinite, her seduction by the Self-willed, her Fall, her purging, and the casting out of her misbegotten passion for illicit knowledge followed. The new emanations, Christus and the Holy Spirit, gave form to the outcast Sophia-Achamoth, and placed her below the Thirteenth Aeon.

In the fallen realm there recurred what had happened in the Heavenly Pattern: Sophia-Achamoth was led astray, and found her way into Chaos and the material Universe in which the Self-willed was Master. But what she had of light was used in the Divine Providence to enlighten men: her path of wandering became to them a path of return: the search of Fallen Man for misguided Wisdom gave God his chance: and she and the enlightened among men were released and redeemed by the descent of Jesus, the Sum of all the divine qualities (and various other Powers who despoiled themselves to do so) (*vide*, P.S. 2nd document, *passim*).

So in spite of the refusal of the Self-willed to let his light shine, a Treasury of Light was established for the Material Universe: and into this was put all the light which the Self-willed and his Principalities and Powers emanated in spite of themselves. IEU (IAO, Jahweh, who corresponded in the Kenoma with Horos in the Pleroma) was the good Power in charge of the Treasury: and from the mixture of light and darkness which "Melkisedek" collected from the disturbed passions of the Rulers of the Aeons (i.e., signs of the Zodiac), Ieu made the souls of men. When the number of the elect was made up, all the light redeemable from the material Universe would have been redeemed, and the Thirteenth Aeon would be destroyed.

(3) A CHRISTIAN TRADITION WITHIN THE SYSTEM OF VALENTINUS.

The Fathers were always particularly anxious to show that the heresiarchs' systems had no Christian foundation. In those days even the best of men were unscrupulous in dealing with opponents: it was no sin to make the worst of a dangerous heresy: if there were any Christian tradition behind it, no reference would be made to that. If Irenaeus and Hippolytus had known of a more Christian kind of Valentinianism, or a Christian tradition within it, they would not mention it. Tertullian does in fact hint at a foundation in tradition, when he says of Valentinus that "finding the by-path of an old opinion, he marked out a path for himself with the subtlety of a serpent" (adv. Val. II).

Valentinus, then, held that there was a Christian tradition delivered to the Apostles which taught of an Angelic Fall—or rather the fall into material manhood of Ideal Man or World Soul. To him had been committed (as to the other Triple Powers) the duty of Creation: the Creative power came to him from God to use: but instead of using it, he hoarded it: in procreation he used only those powers which he did not want. Consequently the Prince of this world ceased to be a Prince of Light: light became to him something to be swallowed to in-

crease his own power. But there is light in the world, and God does not destroy good with evil: he waits until all the good has been sifted out. Parables of our Lord immediately spring to mind, capable of being interpreted in this sense: the talents—the tares—the sower—the drag-net—the seed growing secretly. The fourth Gospel agrees with this tradition in many points, and may have been used by the author of the *Pistis Sophia*: there is, for instance, the passage: “I said to you from at first that ye are not (such as are) out of the world, this I also, I am not out of it.”

I believe the “Secret Tradition” was based upon something genuine—lost teaching of our Lord himself or of his Apostles—for instance, recorded interpretations of parables or logia. Valentinus claimed that such teaching was given to the Apostles only, after the Resurrection and for twelve years after the Ascension. Burkitt observes “this twelve year sojourn of the Apostles near Jerusalem is no peculiarity of our book but a feature of general Christian tradition.” What were they doing? They were preaching and living as a sect of the Jews who believed that the Messiah had come already. But as the final command of the Master had been to preach the Gospel to all nations, it is strange that the Twelve should have remained quietly at Jerusalem for twelve years unless they had some command to do so. It is not certain that they expected such an early *Parousia* as, for instance, did Paul in his early days. They had been steadied by teaching concerning the Kingdom of God before the Ascension from our Lord himself: it would have been in keeping with his method, if he had instructed them to remain in Jerusalem for twelve years to build up a foundation of doctrine. If so, in a sense he did continue his teaching of them through the Holy Ghost who “should guide them into all truth” for those twelve years.

After Paul’s conversion, he received a “revelation of Christ” which was “not of man” (Gal. i, 12). This was not the bare bones of the historical incidents of the Passion and Resurrection, for that was a Gospel which he did receive of

men (I Cor. xv, 3-11). What, then, was this revelation which was tested when he laid the Gospel "privately before them of repute" (Gal. ii, 2)? What was the proof to those others of the genuineness of his call and apostleship, unless it was that what his own revelation had taught him was something which our Lord had taught them—something not generally known. Possibly the mystical experience of II Cor. xii, 2-5 was a part of it: in it he claims to have been so identified with the Risen Christ as to have reached the "third heaven" with him: there he heard words "not lawful for man to utter." If that were so, we could better understand Paul's confident claim to apostleship. It may be significant that Ignatius claimed a similar experience, but refused to dilate upon it. It would not be a secret revelation in the supercilious Gnostic sense, but in the sense of "Cast not your pearls before swine." It would be a mystery hidden from the God of this world (II Cor. iv, 3, 4), his Rulers (I Cor. ii, 6-8), and his children on earth. Ignatius also knew of three mysteries hidden from the Prince of this age—the Virginity of Mary, the Nativity, and the Cross—and a mystery revealed meant to men of those days not only a mystery known but a mystery experienced. "Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the Kingdom of God, but to the rest in parables; that seeing they may not see . . ."

(4) THE SOURCES OF THE CHRISTIAN TRADITION WITHIN HIS SYSTEM.

If Valentinus began his career as a comparatively orthodox modernist Christian of his day—if he was as brilliant as his opponents admit him to have been (Tert. adv. Val. IV; Jerome in Osee, cap. X; ps. Orig. cont. Marcionitas)—he would not have built a system without any traditional foundation. The Pistis Sophia uses both Old and New Testaments, and without doubt other sources which are lost. We may get a hint from the saying of Jesus (P.S. I, p. 35, 65b, 66a) "Hear, O Philippos the happy . . . because thou with Thomas with Matthaïos are those to whom it was given by the First Mystery to write every word which I shall say, with the things which I

shall do, and with every thing which ye shall see. But as for thee, was not completed until now the number of the words which thou wilt write" (the implied meaning is that Philip had a special duty of recording post-Resurrection sayings).

St. Matthew was the Gospel of Antioch: the link between Syria and Egypt was a close one: Valentinus would have known it. We know of an ancient Gospel of Thomas, probably current in Egypt: it is referred to by Origen (*Hom. I on Luke*), quoted by Hippolytus (*V, 7*), Cyril of Jerusalem, and perhaps Irenaeus (*I, 13, 1*). In the Hippolytus quotation appears the logion "He that seeketh me will find me in children from seven years old and upwards" (*M. R. James, Apocr. N.T., p. 15*); this source perhaps gave the author of the *Pistis Sophia* the story of the double of the Boy Jesus, who appeared when he was seven and united himself with him.

But the Gospel of Philip is of more direct interest to us. Our only quotation from it is by Epiphanius (*Haer. XXVI, M. R. James, Apocr. N.T., p. 12*). But the quotation is interesting for two reasons: first because Epiphanius says that the Gospel was produced by Gnostics of Egypt; and second because it is in keeping with Valentinus and the *Pistis Sophia*, but not necessarily heretical. It reads: "The Lord revealed unto me what the soul must say as it goeth up into Heaven, and how it must answer each of the Powers above. 'I have taken knowledge (it saith) of myself, and have gathered myself together out of every quarter and have not begotten (or sown) children unto the Ruler, but have rooted out his roots and gathered together the members that were scattered abroad. And I know thee who thou art, for I (it saith) am of them that are from above'". The introduction by "Philip" has a Gnostic ring, but the logion might be an echo of a genuine post-Resurrection utterance. The Christian is faced with a fallen Power: as man he speaks not only for himself but for the Church, and he denies the right of the Power to check his ascent. "I am of them that are from above" recalls *John xv, 19, and ch. xvii.*

Eusebius tells us, on the authority of Polycrates of Ephesus

(190 a.d.), that Philip the Apostle was buried at Hierapolis (H.E. III, 31, 3). Streeter believes this to have been Philip the deacon, who lived previously in Caesarea with his daughters (Acts xxi, 8, 9). There is, indeed, a school of thought which believes that both Philips had daughters, and both settled and died in Hierapolis. But Streeter is likely to be right. He also suggests that much of St. Luke's Gospel was derived from the Caesarean corpus of tradition, which no doubt Philip and his daughters took with them to Hierapolis. Papias seems to claim to have overlapped Philip as well as his daughters, and may well have done so (H.E. III, 39, 9)—Lightfoot disposed of the arguments for the very late date for Papias, in his *Essays on Supernatural Religion*.

The title of Papias' five volume work has been accepted as *λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις*, but the actual reading is *ἐξηγήσεως*. We can either emend, as has generally been done, to *ἐξηγήσεις* or we can add or understand *περὶ τῆς* before the title, which Eusebius is the only author to mention in full (H.E. III, 39, 1). On the "durior lectio" principle, *ἐξηγήσεως* may be the true reading, and its survival is strange if it is not authentic. If so, Papias' work, apart from the preface and his recollections of the elders, would be not his own exposition of Dominical Oracles, but his own discourses on an exposition by someone else. If so, who would be more likely as an expounder of Dominical Oracles in Hierapolis than Philip—whether Apostle or Deacon? Some of the Oracles were no doubt the Matthaean Oracles: but there were also "other things . . . from unwritten tradition" of which Eusebius was deeply suspicious—"strange parables of the Saviour and teachings of his, and some other things of a rather mythical character". One of these would have been the quotation which we have of Papias from Andreas of Caesarea (in Apoc., c. 34, serm. 12): "To some of them" (Andreas explains "clearly the angels which at first were holy") "he gave dominion also over the arrangement of the Universe, and he commissioned them to exercise their dominion well," (and he says next) "But it so befel that their array came to nought; for the great dragon, the old serpent, who is also

called Satan and the Devil, was cast down, yea, and was cast down to earth, he and his angels." This unwritten tradition most likely came to him through Philip and his daughters, who were actually at Hierapolis: and on his own showing he supplemented it from whatever other apostolic men and elders he could find. "The Oracles" (probably primitive Gospels, perhaps Matthew and Mark, or Q) and the unwritten tradition must have come from Caesarea with Philip; and the latter, which Eusebius deplored, may well have been post-Resurrection teaching by our Lord, "speaking the things concerning the Kingdom of God" to the Apostles: some of the teaching would be an exposition of parables and logia which they had so far failed to understand. Not all of it need have come from our Lord: much may have been the work of the Holy Ghost among the Apostles during their twelve-year stay in Jerusalem. Whatever it was, it was the unwritten tradition of the Jerusalem Church and the Apostles,—and in some sense "secret"—to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks foolishness.

The Pistis Sophia, then, and the evidence from Papias through Eusebius and Andreas, and the only quotation from the Gospel of Philip which we possess (through Epiphanius), all suggest that it (the Gospel of Philip) was a post-Resurrection Gospel explaining difficult sayings and parables, and "of a rather mythical character".

(5) THE CONNEXION OF VALENTINUS WITH ASIA MINOR.

If we had evidence of a connexion between Valentinus and Asia Minor, we should be justified in claiming that the guess at the source of Valentinus' secret tradition was more than a guess; and that the Gospel of Philip which the Valentinians are known to have used in Egypt came originally from Hierapolis; and that its foundation was a real unwritten tradition from whichever Philip it was who lived there. It is not enough to say that Valentinus was the sort of person who must have built up his system on something genuine, if we do not find that something.

There are in fact several indications that Valentinus spent some time in Syria and Asia Minor.

(i) There is very much to the fore in the *Pistis Sophia* a "power of face of lion" which the Self-willed put forth to devour *Sophia-Achamoth*. If the author had read I Peter, which comes from Asia Minor, the reference would be explained: it would then be an unexceptionable use of a term applied to the Devil by the first of the Apostles.

(ii) Among the Churches of Asia Minor there was a very early interest in Principalities and Powers, as we know from St. Paul (*Colossians* and *Ephesians*), and later from Ignatius: Justin Martyr refers to early Gnostics, including Valentinians, in Asia Minor: and some of the great names in early Gnosticism come from there.

(iii) The systems of both Basilides and Valentinus are said to have sprung from Saturnilus, in Syria.

(iv) The most faithful and "orthodox" of the disciples of Valentinus, Axionicus, taught at Antioch (*Tert. adv. Val. IV*).

We know little of the life of Valentinus, and we are not likely to find more direct indications than these, of where it was that his system took shape: its birthplace would seem to have been Syria, and there are probable connexions with Asia Minor. It is not strange, therefore, that Gnostics of Egypt in the fourth century "produce a Gospel forged in the name of Philip the holy disciple" (*Epiphanius: Heresy XXVI, 13: M.R. James, op. cit., p. 12*): if a written or unwritten tradition, brought by Philip from Caesarea to Hierapolis, was the foundation of the system of Valentinus, we should expect him to treat it as a Gospel—a secret tradition which would more and more assume a Gnostic colour with interpolations and glosses by Gnostics scribes—but genuine in origin.

It is possible that this post-Resurrection Gospel of Philip was, in its unwritten form, used by Papias. It almost certainly included a reference to some kind of pre-cosmic fall—a commission given to Angelic Rulers which they misused: this appears both in Papias and in the *Pistis Sophia*, and is much to

the fore in the orthodox Egyptian theology of Alexandria. It included teaching about danger from Evil Powers, who opposed all who tried to reach a level higher than that of the fallen Ruler. Finally it included a Redemption by Jesus Christ through whom the soul could ascend to God.

(6) THE RESULTS OF Gnostic MODERNISM.

Our Lord clothed the mystery of the Kingdom in parables, and so brought that Kingdom into touch with human life and ordinary activity. Valentinus made use of allegories, fantastic in form if philosophically satisfactory. He maintained that Divine Ideas and attributes were so intensely divine that they must be personal: he was probably right: but the persons of his allegories were not real persons: they were figures in a dream, and his greatest achievement was a certain nightmare quality in the figures of the Fallen Rulers. Fallen Angels may be a sort of nightmare, but unfallen Angels should not be a dream.

The system led inevitably to the very things which the Pistis Sophia condemned—magic and mystery making. His Ultimate God was so abysmal and inaccessible that even Jesus himself never seemed to reach him. The figure of Jesus, without being actually Docetic, was neither completely human, nor completely Divine: he was the archetype of the Arian Christ, the Apollinarian Christ, and (paradoxically) of the Nestorian Christ. Men soon began to seek again for formulae for curbing demons and charming Angels. Angelolatry sprang from the very system which aimed at showing that man needed no Angelic mediators.

From an Angelic philosophy followed the flight of the Angels from Western Christianity. The system which exalted them frightened the Western Fathers away from them. The pre-cosmic Fall, fantastically presented, opened a door to the Manichees. A philosophy, in no important fundamentals wrong in its cosmic system, broke down because in it God and man failed to meet: there was no true reconciliation. The seed sown showed its weakness in the crop which it produced: and

the final condemnation of the Valentinian Gnostics must be that they were responsible first for the loss of a sane and real view of Good and Evil Powers—a loss which in the West has had lasting results: and second and more important, that they offered to the world a Christ who was neither God nor Man. Archetypal Man, however truly begotten of God in his likeness, can never vindicate God's ways to men: ultimately he is other than God—*Homoiousios* but not *Homoousios*. The first Adam (*redivivus*) can never fully redeem: nor, indeed, can the Second Adam, if he be only the sum of all the already-existing Divine Qualities—and such was the Jesus of Valentinus. God himself must answer Transgression: all real life is meeting, and in every emergency God's Unchangingness appears to finite beings to change: if God has acted, then from our angle he is other than he was before he acted. This is Redemption, and the New Commandment, and *Agape*—and it comes from the very Being of God himself—and it looks to us like something between sympathy and forgiveness and courage.

If essential Godmanhood, or the Second Adam, or the emanation Jesus suffered for my sins, then he is better than the God of whom he is the Image: but if suffering and sympathy and forgiveness and courage belong to God himself, then I am reconciled. "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself . . ."—"The Word was God"—"the Father abiding in me doeth his works". It is paradoxical and inconceivable: we must expect no less: its symbol is the Cross.

ELIZABETH BURNET, 1661-1709

By C. KIRCHBERGER

ON a morning of July 1696, John Locke received, at his lodging at Whitehall, a letter from an unknown admirer. As he turned over the small sheet covered with a fine pointed regular handwriting, and read the opening civilities, the courteous apologies for this intrusion on his time, followed by the most humble protestation of ignorance with deference to his authority, he found that his female correspondent desired of him, an explanation. Rumours had been spread concerning his opinion on the Sacraments in connexion with a pamphlet recently published. She could not, from her knowledge of his integrity and reputation, from reading his works, imagine that anything detrimental to the Faith would come from him, and desired in her distress of mind, a word of reassurance from him.

John Locke must have thought well of his correspondent's evident sincerity and intellectual capacity; she was clearly not one of the Bluestockings, and if she belonged to Stillingfleet's devout coterie, she certainly appeared to have more understanding of his ideas than was to be expected from one of her sex—and more courage also.

This lady was Elizabeth Berkeley, a widow of thirty-five years of age, later to become the third wife of Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury. About twenty letters from her to Locke have recently come to light. She is also known for her *Method of Devotion*, 1709. Miss H. C. Foxcroft, in her *Life of Bishop Burnet*, draws attention to two MSS. of his third wife in MS. Rawl. D 1092, a travel journal and a religious diary with other papers, and has given a short account of her work and character. Elizabeth Burnet, however, seems worthy, especially in view

of the Locke letters, of a short memoir, not wholly overshadowed by the figure of her celebrated second husband.

We may think of Mrs. Burnet as the last of the long line of seventeenth century "devout ladies." There was a tradition of piety carried on from the closing of the religious houses in the sixteenth century, by the ladies of two centuries, chiefly those whose social position gave them the security and leisure to develop the life of retirement and prayer. Little Gidding set an example and stimulated the ideal, but it was found apart from this more communal experiment. The memoirs, diaries, and journals of such well known ladies as Lettice, Viscountess Falkland; Mary, Countess of Warwick; Lady Mordaunt; Rachel, Lady Russell; Lady Margaret Maynard; Margaret, Lady Hoby, will come to mind. They maintained the tradition of prayer, private as well as public, the study of the Scriptures and holy books, the instruction of their dependents and all the exacting works of charity which their station in life demanded. The daily routine which these memoirs reveal and which is to be found in Mrs. Burnet's *A Method of Devotion* might well challenge the standards of devotion and fortitude set in our modern religious houses.

Like her predecessors, Elizabeth Burnet took her place in the social and political world of her day with zeal, courage and dignity and was regarded by her friends as almost a saint, and by her opponents with the greatest esteem. Her husband, the bishop, says in his autobiography, that even his motherless children's need would perhaps not have decided him to marry again, "had I not known one of the most extraordinary persons that has lived in this age both for great knowledge and discretion, a sublime piety and one whose deportment shined in all places where she had lived." And after his marriage, "both I and my children were happy in her beyond expression, for she was one of the strictest Christians and one of the most heavenly minded persons I have ever met."

Elizabeth Blake, the daughter of Sir Richard Blake of Southampton and Elizabeth the daughter of Dr. Bathurst a London physician of repute, was born in 1661 and grew up in

the seclusion of a devout home. We hear that from "eleven years of age she began to have a true sense of religion and read with great application the books which were put into her hands, but was not quite satisfied with them, aspiring after more solid and sublimer notions . . . on this account then, more than ordinary care was taken to make her think meanly of herself, she being bred up in the greatest privacy possible."

Here, then, we have the keynote to her character and the foundation on which was built the inquiring and philosophical habit of mind, the deep devotion and solid theological learning which later in life made her capable of the friendship and esteem of such men as Dr. Fell, Dr. Stillingfleet, Locke and Burnet.

Her early habits of study and piety were fostered when Dr. Fell, Bishop of Oxford, her godfather, arranged her marriage at 17 with his ward Robert Berkeley of Spetchley, Worcestershire, a good man but of poor intelligence and weak in both body and character. His mother, a zealous Roman Catholic made every effort to convert her son and his young wife, and Elizabeth obliged herself to greater strictness of life and devotion and deeper study of her own religion, in order "to preserve her husband and herself from the influences his mother and her advisers brought to bear." Her biographer witnesses to the insight, discretion and tenderness of her behaviour at the time, "yet, considering the particular turn of his mind, and the great deference he had to his mother, she found herself obliged to be very tender and careful that he might not be disturbed with unnecessary disputes about religion, in which and in her whole management in this respect, there appeared a discretion admired by all that knew her."

She occupied the six years of her married life in the country, with the reading of good books, the practices of religion and the works of charity, especially the instruction of her poorer neighbours. When, however, Dr. Fell died and his influence over her husband was withdrawn, the efforts of her mother-in-law, especially upon the accession of James II, were redoubled,

and the young Elizabeth prevailed with her husband to leave England for a time. They travelled in the Netherlands and finally settled at The Hague, where they became acquainted with the Burnets, and Mary Burnet and Elizabeth became friends. Here, too, was laid the foundation of her political friendships which later ripened into important and influential contacts to which her travel journal bears witness. By this time her husband's relations had acquired a better appreciation of Elizabeth's character. Through their letters to friends in the Catholic provinces of Holland, hospitality and kindness were showered upon the young couple "letters being sent without their knowledge to Brussels, Ghent and Liège recommending her in a very particular manner, as one, that had she been, as they call it, of the Catholic Church, her piety and virtue were great enough to entitle her to the character of a Saint."

At the Revolution they returned to Spetchley and she lived there engaged in good works till her husband's death in 1693. She then continued her life in more particular retirement and devotion, giving herself, however, to the execution of her husband's bequest, the foundation from his estate of the Hospital for the Poor at Worcester, and to the building of poor children's schools. We hear that she took special care of young persons and of all her husband's Protestant relations "to whom she continued to be as a mother all her life." Among her abundant charities she provided for many of the badly-paid country clergy, helping them with gifts of money and books, "Heartily esteeming them for the sake of their functions and labours."

Bishop Stillingfleet and his wife were her close friends, and she stayed frequently with them at Worcester and at the Commandery, the house of another friend Robert Wylde, who helped her with her business affairs. Later she resided also with her sister, the wife of Mr. Justice Dormer, at Lincoln's Inn Fields. She greatly esteemed the judge, and among his friends no doubt met many who were to be very useful to her second husband. They were also next door to Mr. Locke, who had moved from Oxford to London.

During her widowhood she wrote the first draft of her book *A Method of Devotion*, a collection of instructions and prayers intended for her own use, but, on the advice of her friends, she later had it published anonymously at her own expense, that she might distribute copies among the young people whom she befriended.

At the death of Mary Burnet, in 1698, she commended to her husband, the bishop, her very dear friend Elizabeth Berkeley, hoping that he would make her the mother of her children. In 1700 the bishop asked Elizabeth to fulfill this wish of his dead wife and after some consideration she consented. They were married in the early summer of that year. The meditation with which the fragment of her diary in MS. Rawl. D 1092 begins, was written soon after this occasion and reflects the hesitation she felt.

The bishop's appreciation of his wife went very deep, and he showed it from the first in the provision he made in his will, that she should have sole charge and authority over his children, if he predeceased her. On their marriage he insisted that she should retain full control over her considerable fortune, a trait as generous as it was unusual in that age, asserting "that he had brought blessing and happiness enough into his family by bringing herself into it."

Elizabeth, always most conscientious about money, notes in her diary that she paid one-fifth of her fortune yearly into the bishop's funds so that the Church should not be at expense for her sake, nor those funds provided by the faithful for charitable purposes misused, nor the bishop's own charities curtailed. The rest of her fortune she devoted to her private charities.

Two children were born of this marriage but both died in infancy and the mother devoted herself anew to the care and education of her stepchildren and to the furthering of all her husband's interests. The children all bore her the greatest affection and respect.

Her health, never very good, grew steadily worse, and

consumption was feared. Therefore, in 1707, it was planned that she should combine a voyage to Spa to drink the waters with a stay in the Netherlands on political and financial business. She took with her her stepdaughter Elizabeth, later Mrs. West, and her two stepsons, William the eldest and Thomas the youngest of the bishop's children. They were to spend a year at the University of Leyden, and their affectionate and anxious mother has several notes about them in her travel journal. She records also therein business transactions and financial and political *démarches* with which both her husband and the Duchess of Marlborough, her special friend, had charged her. A great number of celebrated names occur in the journal, and she appears to have been received everywhere with marked courtesies and privileges.

This frail woman, who had suffered all her life, records in her journal how she set out from place to place, and found strength in God and in her trust in him; how, after bad attacks, a day's rest and prayer, the hearing of a good sermon would enable her to continue. After a journey from Haarlem to Amsterdam, in pouring rain and high winds, she writes that she was none the worse but "by this I find, travelling, by degrees hardens the body and makes it much less liable to colds." And, in another place, exhorts herself not "to heed her indispositions unduly."

From The Hague, the two young boys were sent on with a servant to Leyden, but two days later their stepmother travelled there herself to see them properly established.

"I went to Leyden and was well satisfied with placing the children by reason I thought the people discret and vertuous. I find it not so easy a matter to do such things and am very glad I came to Holland, for it is not possible to have right notions of persons or things at a distance, many things falling out one cannot foresee or transact by letter, I hope God will bless my endeavours for their good, for my trust is in His mercy . . . I saw the Anotomy school, there are many curious things but I love not such sights."

But after a few weeks news came from the tutor "of poor

Thome's pertness and ungovernableness." There is no comment, but on her return journey from Hanover she visits Leyden again and records her relief, "found the children well and commended by their master, for which I bless God, for the health of their minds is what I most earnestly desire." And again, before sailing, she hears from the Master: "He said Mr. B. (William) behaved very well and soberly at Leyden, attended their college diligently. Mr. B. was much beloved and esteemed very grave and discreet but Thomy not a little stubborn and not easily ruled by his brother . . ." Tom had always been wild and remained so, but he became his father's biographer and did other good work, whereas the staid William proved a feckless man and had to be rescued by his father and his brother many times from difficulties. Even earlier, their stepmother had pleaded for William when the bishop had sternly removed him from Cambridge, and Colbatch, his tutor, speaks of her great tenderness and concern. Her biographer says that "all the children loved and respected her as if she had brought them into the world."

Meanwhile the younger Elizabeth was accompanying her mother everywhere. She also wrote a childish journal which precedes that of Mrs. Burnet in MS. Rawl. D 1092 at p. 100 and shows the young lady was far more interested in the parties and excursions, shows and sights than her senior, but there is no indication that she was kept in the background, they seem to have gone everywhere together.

There was another aspect to Elizabeth Burnet's character. The same ardent generosity, clarity of thought and reliance on principle, which marked her religious life, is apparent in her comments on the affairs of the political world with which she and her husband were so greatly concerned. She was a whole-hearted Whig and upheld Whig interests, yet she could befriend those who held opposite views. The pages of the journal cover innumerable conversations with men and women of all parties, from the Duke of Marlborough, the Electress of Hanover, down to the humblest parish curé of a village. A code number, such as the Duke, the Duchess and she used in their private

correspondence, hides the identity of most of these people from us, but her interest in and reaction to the various views held abroad, of English policy and character do not remain hidden.

Bishop Burnet says of her that her zeal for politics was perhaps "her only excess." But she was not blind to the faults of her friends. Her character sketch of the Electress of Hanover is very shrewd, she sums up the characters of her two friends C.B. and Mrs. Fitch, who died in the same week, with unsparing honesty in the one case and humble sorrow in the other (p. 124-5).

Of the Electress she wrote: "She said many things well of the proofs and providence of God but I found she run (?) much on the Cal(vinistic) idea that God inclined us to ask or to use his grace . . . she speaks with too little gard as of the Necessity of things . . . and seems to have too much leaning to the philosophers that maintain a chain of causes and necessity of acts . . ." (p. 126, 8).

After repeating some of the Electress's political opinions she adds: "Such things she says with great simplicity and without ill-meaning, but people go away with wrong impressions . . ." And again, "What she says of him (?) is more pity than esteem, she is very good-natured and loved her mother's relations and many things she says come from those springs and not an approbation of their acts or principles, but foolish or evil people may easily mistake her."

Notwithstanding all the Duchess of Marlborough's faults Elizabeth remained her staunch friend. In Coxe's *Life of the Duke* he prints a few of Elizabeth Burnet's letters to Sarah, and part of one written at the news of the victory of Blenheim deserves to be quoted, if only to prove that piety may go hand in hand with natural enthusiasm and overflowing affectionate demonstrativeness. "*Aug. 12. 1704* . . . I do not wonder you are all joy . . . I am really giddy with joy, and if I rave you must forgive me. I can lament for no private loss [she had that week buried her second child] since God has given me such a

general mercy. In death it would be a matter of joy to me to have lived so long as to hear it. The bishop said he could not sleep, his heart was so charged with joy. He desire your Grace would lay up that little letter as a relic that cannot be valued enough." This was the Duke's private message to her written on the back of a tavern reckoning, on the battlefield, in the hour of victory.

At Brussels, a member of the council came to see her; "he appeared a very honest and knowing man, said he had read several of the bishop's books, his travels, his History of the Reformation, etc., he talked of religion and government with more freedom than is usual for men of the Roman Church: he told me he had read Mr. Locke's books . . ."

Her comments about places, architecture, gardens are equally interesting. She has an eye for the general aspect of the population of a country, so at her first sight of Rotterdam she says: "the whole town is full, and full of business people; . . . only the people a little too much engaged in their own private interest." On arriving at Liège, "It is a town full of people and trade but the people and place are mean and dirty in clothes and buildings, and look not as in Holland who have the appearance of more freedom and a better government. At Maastrick we lodged at the Herkmet a very good inn for provisions; at Liège at the Golden Hedgehog, the Inn is dirty but the people good and obliging and who provide very well and dress meat well." At Leyden "we went to see the Physick Garden, there are as they say 7,000 plants ranged under their several families, in great order, but the garden is mean and nothing to compare to Oxford, so are all their schools and public buildings but there are many professors of great learning."

There is an appreciation of a visit to a retired great lady who lives in the country. Elizabeth draws a picture almost as if by Watteau, of the quiet garden walks, of some rural actors under the trees and the peasants in their national dress with embroidered gowns, many having "bodkins and ear jewels of gold and precious stones."

Arrived at Spa Elizabeth starts on her cure and finds that the waters make her very sick: however she persevered and with her usual courage finds something good to say about it (p. 118), and when she leaves on Aug. 19, writes: "Left Spa. Blessed be God in much better health than when I came; take care to employ it to God's glory. We went 7 leagues in a thing with two wheels called a basket, it was most weary, sheltered neither from wind nor rain. The country was most mountainous rocky and full of woods and springs of water; we came to a village called (?Frepon?) where we found nothing to eat and took a float that brought us to Liège. The river is extremely rapid and full of rocks and falls of water for miles and other little rivulets, that make a noise a little dreadful and are dangerous in great inundations . . ." She again comments on the poverty of the countryside and the people and quotes the curate of Liège as saying "that of 300 families half wanted alms and some are so poor as to live 15 days on carlots and water and often on wild herbs." All this she attributes to the depredations of strangers and to the bad government. Repeatedly in this journal she calls to mind the better conditions in England: (July 28. p. 118) "I could not but bless God for the happiness of England and reflect on the happiness of our situation and moderation of our government that in the midst of a long war when most other places were overrun with poverty we enjoy so great plenty even so abounding with superfluities; may God give us grace to use it well . . ."

Notwithstanding her earlier conflicts with Roman Catholics she appears to have made and renewed many Catholic friendships and to have visited and been visited by many priests in high position who discussed the religious position in regard to the succession freely with her. In each town she visited the churches and religious houses and describes what she saw and heard. Her comments are never prejudiced or unkind even when registering matters of which she cannot approve. She was scrupulously careful not to intrude in churches where High Mass was going on, feeling unable to join in the customary rites, feared to hurt the susceptibilities of others. She was

genuinely interested and appreciated the ideals of some of the religious Orders and gives us some remarks worth quoting: (Aug. 20. p. 121 Liège.) "I went to take leave of the English nuns. They are called Sepulchrines; their rule is gentle and their habit handsome, they wear a red cross on a white surplice. The rest is black, a long robe with a crimson rope of silk that looks very gracefull . . ." p. 123v. at Antwerp: "I went also to the St. Teresians, . . . they seem to me to have more of the spiritual part of religion than any other order I have observed, a greater simplicity of life, which I impute most to the larger portion of time they allow for recollection, mental prayer, and to those spiritual maxims and sentences which run through the works of St. Teresa their reformer." This looks as if she was familiar with St. Teresa's works.

After visiting the Bernardines near Liège, she comments on the new provisions for their stricter enclosure, which had been explained to her. The older nuns were discontented with the curtailing of their freedom: she writes, "from which I learnt that 'tis not the sanctity of rule or manner of life that changes their hearts but that with all that, few would be true recluses did not necessity or an incapacity to go out, force them, so that, in the world or out of it, the cloister can only be made in the heart, and the true Religious are they who have the infinite law of God's will writ in their hearts; that will do without the law of man's devising, but the other will not do without it . . ." Moreover she takes objection "to the exact observance paid to the will of the Superior: how much fonder man is of the laws of their own devising than of God's law" and contrasts the general indifference of all classes of society to the laws most strictly commanded by God, such as obedience to parents and kings, subjection to husbands and masters, "though the good of families, states, nay kingdoms depend on it, yet here where the good extends no farther than the quiet of a useless community, how sacred are they kept . . ." The sincerity of these remarks has its value though she failed to appreciate the true nature of religious obedience.

Returning once more to Mrs. Burnet's interest in educa-

tion, there is an account of Madame de Maintenon's institute for young ladies. Someone had reported on the methods observed there and how when Madame de Maintenon had to be at Versailles she was wont to take one of the class of prefects to keep her company, "where they waited in her room and saw the King and Court, which, D.P. exprest was next to heaven" to which Elizabeth adds "but nothing sure is less like, for injustice, impurity, pride and cruelty are liker another place than Heaven." She certainly had a discerning eye for children. At Hanover she several times saw the young Prince. "I saw the young prince, a more beautiful child I never saw, of a midling size, the most delicate white (skin?) and very lively eyes, a pretty mouth, round face, sat upright and firm and looked about him with a look as composed as a man, neither laughed nor cried, but as if he was observing every lady and had as great signs in his face of a child likely to make a wise man, as ever I saw." (p. 129.)

There are many small touches of endearing tenderness and tact. She reports a conversation with a lady who expatiated on the disadvantages and unsuitability of second marriages. "I agreed with her and that there are very few circumstances that make them commendable and not many that make them not blameable." No comment or self-justification!

Of the many good sermons she reports she was especially moved by one, by a celebrated preacher at Meinem (p. 121v). As she writes her enthusiasm is again kindled and the handwriting, often cramped, becomes large and clear.

"It was a good service, little or nothing but what was of the Son of God; that love was always an active principle in proportion to its degrees, that we sadly deceived ourselves in our love of God, that it was not saying a few prayers; a fit of devotion that made us take a religious habit, but a whole life of obedience, for the love of God resisting all sin and things forbidden and doing what was commanded and being ready to part with all when God called for it with submission and without murmur, as children, estate, etc., that fire could as well not burn as love not be active; that it was impossible those could love God who never thought of Him, but by obligation, at the rehearsing of

devotions, and that it should offer itself in charity to our Brothers . . .”

Coming towards the end of her journey, she speaks of her improved health and the benefits she has received. She rebukes herself (p. 132) for being “too secure in prosperity”, “for at first I was very sensible of every day’s preservation but being near the end of my journey I grew more secure and did not exercise so constant a lively dependance on God that I ought and did at first. We are always under His providence and the least withdrawal of His protection leaves us in confusion and exposed to all evil from without, evil spirits and evil men, and from within the disorders of passion and humour.” The journey home was made early in November 1707, and is full of details of the movements of the Duke, who had just arrived in Holland and came to meet her and hear whatever news she brought. He entertained her and caused her to stay at one of his palaces, and saw her on board ship for England. She speaks of her joy at seeing Dover again.

One more short year of life remained. Her improved health gave her friends much hope, and apparently that winter passed satisfactorily. The next autumn her friends persuaded her to go into Society in London. It was a year of extraordinary frosts, but she survived these well; when, however, the thaw came, in January 1708/9, she caught a pleuritic cold and died within a week. She was buried at Spetchley by her first husband’s grave, according to a promise she had made him and which Bishop Burnet, even in his sorrow, wished to respect.

A short paragraph from her Diary, which her sincerity will raise above any suspicion of complacency, may form a suitable epitaph:

“When I have apprehended death near, my consolation next the belief of God’s goodness, the Gospel covenant, and promises in Christ, etc., has been with respect to myself, that I have ever desired God’s glory, loved and approved virtue, tho’ passion and ignorance have often deceived me, and been very desirous of the happiness and perfection of all good Christians, of all mankind, and that faith and charity might more abound; so that

I did not hardly more sensibly feel the desires of my own happiness than that of others, from which I hope I am a true disciple of Christ, who has given our love to one another as a mark of discipleship." (p. 138.)

THE "METHOD OF DEVOTION."

The *Method of Devotion*, which Mrs. Burnet had first planned for her own guidance and later published anonymously, was issued again with her name in 1709 with a memoir compiled largely at the bishop's dictation, by T. Goodwyn, Archdeacon of Oxford, later Bishop of Cashel. This memoir was used later by Ballard in his *Memoirs of British Ladies*, 1775. The book is a collection of instructions and prayers, after the fashion of the period, very long, intended more for reading than spontaneous devotion. The instructions cover all the needs of the family and household daily life together with directions for public prayer and devotions for those solemn Days of Fasting, appointed by the State. Very detailed self-examination follows the instruction, and this, too, is found in many English devotional treatises as well as the Catholic manuals of France which had come to be known in England in the wake of the Restoration court. The book was intended for those who might be without good books or guidance and is in some respects a supplement to the Catechism, for the author was herself learned in the teaching of the best Anglican theologians and probably acquainted with Catholic devotional literature.

However greatly our own taste in these matters has changed, we must acknowledge that the late seventeenth century, and Elizabeth Burnet in particular, excelled in the intricacies of self-analysis, which allowed no hidden subterfuge of the heart to escape exposition. The new school of philosophy, with its emphasis on the nature of ideas and the bias towards materialistic conceptions, had its effect even upon Christian psychology. Elizabeth Burnet shows, more than once, a strong suspicion that she realized some of the dangers this way of thinking might involve, and reacted towards it by emphasizing that the power of the will together with the gifts of Grace could

and should be victorious over passion and circumstance. The diary frequently supports this contention.

In the meditations we find that she touches on many problems that often underlie religious devotion, and for want of elucidation tend to disordered conceptions of piety. Thus (p. 210) in outlining ways of joining fruitfully in the public services of the Church, she makes very clear distinctions between the nature of public and private prayer and lays down the line of thought suitable for each, and the extreme necessity for an intelligent, painstaking participation in the public offices. There is an illuminating note on the special need of mental self-discipline for those who attend cathedral services, where much singing is liable to lull the mind into a state not profitable to true spirituality. That by this she does not condemn the use of music or underestimate the value of beauty in worship, we shall see in the diary.

She dwells also on the twofold necessity of instructing the mind by sermons and reading, together with the duty of private prayer, and warns those whose natural preferences lead them to neglect one or other of these means of progress. To facilitate the intelligent appreciation of public worship she recommends the use of some commentary on the Liturgy, and in her selection of books appended to her "Method", she mentions Nelson's *Companion to Festivals and Fasts*, a book new then but to become one of the favourite books of its kind in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Of the many illuminating touches on subjects generally familiar, we might quote her advice to those who, having a family, should spend some time on the Sunday, "in catechising the younger sort; but let it be before the rest of the family, whose years perhaps, more than their knowledge, sets them above that discipline." We can see Elizabeth with her troublesome Thomas, and smug William and devout Gilbert, a past mistress in all the wiles of family diplomacy !

The foundation of all piety and morality is to her the love of God and man, and she is unsparing in her denunciation of

all forms of hypocrisy which substitute the conventional routine of observances for the true marks of Christian discipleship.

The *Method of Devotion* is set down in good plain well-knit prose, and we have the bishop's testimony that it was all her own, he merely corrected the spelling and punctuation occasionally ! And his further terse comment was that she not only wrote it but lived every word of it herself ! Her own view of it may best be gathered from a note in the diary (p. 140): "When I was young I thought that devotion could be got from forms and the power of well chosen words " but "now I am convinst that prayer is in the heart and will, not in the expression; the liveliest forms without the heart's attention is heavy and the flattest, with it has spirit; and if our heart was empty of the world and its affections, God will fill it without any form; when my mind was so prepared I never wanted words and then I erroneously thought that that life was in some degree the effect of proper words and so often wrote things down, but when the mind was absent I found the same words had as little force as others to fix my attention and when my mind was present the coldest forms did not want heat and power."

There are, however, pages of prayer and outpouring to God in her diary and in the travel journal which, shielded by the intimacy of her "closet", reveal more directly the sensitiveness of her conscience and the capacity of her spirit and affections. She could write pages of rapid, clear, easy prose in exposition of a chapter of the Romans (diary) or on any subject she had at heart, yet, more often, her habit of aspiration breaks in upon what she is discussing and argument or narrative end in prayer or aspiration.

At the end of the "Method" is appended a "List of books suggested for a private study, which may be altered or improved as every one sees fit." After the Bible, the Prayer-book follow Tillotson's Sermons; *The Whole Duty of Man*; Burnet's *Pastoral Discourses*; then a great number of contemporary theologians, Pearson, Grotius, Bp. Williams, Whitcote, Norris,

More's *Ethics*; Wake; Sherlock; Stillingfleet; Chief Justice Hale's *Contemplations*; Eachard's *Ecclesiastical History*; Nelson's *Companion* and his treatise on the frequent receiving of the Sacrament; Scougal's *Life of God in the Soul of Man*; and nearly all the works of Simon Patrick. We can understand Mrs. Burnet's appreciation of Bishop Patrick: his devotion and sweetness, his gifts of creative imagination, his commentaries so greatly influenced by Patristic inspiration, must have made a special appeal to her own disposition.

It is remarkable, however, that the Carolingian divines are not named, nor any of the great Roman Catholic authors whom she must have known. It may be that her bias against Romanism accounts for this, or that as the list was intended for the general public it was considered wiser to omit anything of the kind. But that is not to impugn her catholicity of outlook, for among the books recommended is "Dr. Brown of Dublin College, his Answer to a book entituled, *Christianity not mysterious*: as also to all those who set up for Reason and Evidence in opposition to Revelation and the Mysteries."

Finally, there is the valuable advice that each soul should choose the mode of prayer and meditation that is found most congenial and fruitful, and not to be tied down by the advice of others. This is borne out by a note on subjects of conversations with Mrs. Fitch and C.B., her intimate friends: (Diary p. 154)

"to be strict to rules, but not to make these rules too strict, not to enjoin anything as necessary and of obligation to ourselves, but has the authority of a divine command or prohibition . . . or what is by observation found dangerous to your self or may have given scandal or a bad example to your neighbour."

And further on:

"Things necessary are plain in Scripture, all are obliged to study it; . . . not to be staggered at the objections of atheists, their principles less reasonable and less intelligible, have less (than) no foundation, and are liable to stronger and more confounding objections. To secure yourself from their delusions, build your religion on sure and large grounds; dont place its chief defence on what is obscure or unintelligible, or trifling and of no advan-

tage to a holy useful life, but on what is plain in revelation, and its benefit obvious to an honest tho' not elevated reasoner."

THE DIALOGUE ON MARRIAGE.

Among the moral questions which Elizabeth considered most frequently in her writings were the various aspects of married life and the problems—religious, social and legal—connected with marriage. Thus, in the diary, p. 144, she asks why the state of chastity is incompatible with marriage, as temperance is compatible with eating; and why original sin should be considered to be perpetuated through the fulfilment of an institution commanded by God, or why original sin should be connected with marriage, when it was first caused by gluttony, or rather by disobedience? The Dialogue on Marriage (which follows the Diary at p. 157 of the MS.) was evidently intended to deal with these and allied questions in a comprehensive way. Unfortunately only the second "quire" has been preserved, pp. 157-203, which takes up the argument at the point where the value of public engagements was being discussed by the four or more persons, A, B, G, D-F. The advantages of public rather than private engagement are considered from the nature of the dangers involved in privacy, the social problems, the legal questions on contract, the power of parents and, incidentally, the right and wrong use of this power, and the religious principles underlying every aspect of the married state are, or were, touched upon. Some of this makes heavy going, but even in this part, the character of the four protagonists is indicated and the dialogue is not merely a literary form but an intelligent discussion between friends. We know that Mrs. Burnet voices her opinions as B; with her were, I think, her two friends Mrs. Fitch, and C.B. of whose deaths, both within a few days, we hear in the Travel Journal. These were the staid matrons, probably, F and C or D and a young and newly married woman, G, who asks the questions is also indicated. It is impossible to say that these figures remain constant, partly because there is no "devil's advocate", everybody contributing something reasonable and cogent, in the

manner of a Socratic dialogue, and the opinion of Mrs. Burnet is not pressed beyond what the manners of that courteous age considered proper. The discussion is, however, broken off, again after the fashion of real life, when the ladies decide they have had enough of the solemnities, and adjourn for recreation and for lighter gossip. Now more mundane matters are aired, such as the entertainment of friends, the choice of a house, the disposal of house-room, and the furnishing of rooms. The proper etiquette for receiving friends gives the wit of the party occasion for a clever display of satire upon the manners of the "parvenu" or the senseless adherence to court etiquette in private houses, among those who are no longer as important as they imagine. Mrs. Burnet here maintains the commonsense point of view, and while indulging freely in the fun, we observe that later she has scored out some of the more cynical passages and made marginal adjustments. This part of the dialogue is extremely entertaining and deserves quoting.

p. 194. They have been discussing the folly of retaining so great a number of rooms in houses which were once public palaces and had real objects for the various apartments, and are now but the residence of one or two persons. One of the friends describes a visit to such a lady:

G. Since I find so many of my mind I might well venture to own, I had much ado to forbear laughing, when, after being received at the first door by three or four footmen you are delivered by one of them, to I cant tell what officer, who conducts you to the door of audience, where after the visit is paid, and the lady has made her compliment of attending on you, which is always best when it is shortest, and you are soonest left to be reconducted to your coach, in the same order you came out of it.

A. But you forget a principal attendant, My Lady's woman, who sits in the outward room as like a statue and unemployed as My Lady herself who, for want of other business waits on you to your coach.

B. And is that business enough, especially if her Lady has a full flight of visitors? that is indeed some diversion else methinks, she has but a dull time of it . . .

B. But in such cases she is of use . . . to divert her Lady for you must know that for herself or her Lady, to look as if they

had any employment is esteemed very improper, work or books disturb the neatness of the home, and must be censured for affectation of knowledge or housewifery.

And so on . . .

Without this part of the dialogue one would not have suspected Elizabeth of such gifts of humour, except that we know her popularity among young people and her interest in their guidance and education. Like Fénelon, she realizes that the minds of the young are more easily impressed by such dramatic teaching than by the more prosaic methods of instruction. She had, as we know, meditated on these things especially in connexion with Madame de Maintenon's system.

The dialogue exhibits also Mrs. Burnet's fairmindedness: repeatedly she allows one interlocutor to set forth a case which, though opposed to her own views, presents some good explanation of the disputed point. Thus, in criticizing the burden of cheese-paring economy, thrust upon those who, through wilful past extravagance and ostentation, are now involved in the miseries of dissimulation, and "the endless waste of time and care of making the finest entertainment, choosing the prettiest clothes and furniture, at least expence, that distracts their thoughts . . ." to which B. replies "you forget how many have less value for their time than they have for their money, they want more than they have of the one and have more than they know how to use of the other." Without blame in her own case, Elizabeth knew the circumstances well. There are many regretful entries in the *Travel Journal*, as to her wearisome quests for silk and lace and fine linen and cloth, in the Netherlands, France and Germany, to supply the home household's needs, with the sad reflection that the prices were not cheaper than at home, and that she was tired to death of the waste of time and fatigue entailed, and consequent mental inability for higher things.

Another practical point made in the Dialogue, is that the first duty of housewifeliness is "clenliness and buty", in which she includes order, comeliness, a choice of appropriate furnish-

ing, ornament and personal clothing. We saw how, in travelling, Mrs. Burnet constantly referred to the cleanliness or dirt of the inns, towns and people she observed. This instinct for order and love of beauty, especially in her appreciation of natural beauty, of well laid out gardens and the countryside, must also have endeared her to young folk.

The final merit of this part of the Dialogue, which reads like a true conversation among friends, is that the ideas thrown out are not exhaustively treated, one remark provokes another and different but associated trains of thought, so that a great number of minor subjects are covered with interest and ease. All this is a tribute to the prolific versatility of the author, whose Christian faith and principles illuminate the whole.

THE RELIGIOUS DIARY.

The Religious Diary, which is preserved in MS. Rawl. D 1092 pp. 136-156, is not a day by day account of her life, but a gathering of meditations, prayers and sometimes philosophical reflections, in which she records impressions of conversations, or books read. She uses the form of dialogue occasionally, as in the dialogue between a Papist and a Protestant and the Dialogue on Marriage. The diary was perhaps copied from loose papers, for those items which are dated do not follow each other in chronological order, nor are they complete in themselves, but what is left is of extreme interest.

There are first some prayers on her second marriage (p. 135) and on behalf of her husband. The first of these passages sheds a light upon both of them. It has been quoted by Miss Foxcroft in her *Life of the bishop* (p. 380) but seems to warrant repetition here. She begs forgiveness if she has erred

“in leaving a more solitary for a more secular state . . . I desired to chuse the life more usefull to thy glory, nor was or am I conscious that care, pleasures, riches, honour had any influence in my choice. My temper and genius never affected a married state, which was first an act of obedience to my parents, and now an act rather of my will and understanding than of passion or inclination; I considered the circumstances of the person I

chose made it, as far as I could judge, best for him to marry, with respect to the age of his children, the place he then held at Court, which for one of his free and generous conversation and good nature, free from cunning or deceit, and so easily imposed on by those who had made a sincere and faithful friend of great advantage (to themselves), and although I wanted all other qualifications I thought myself capable of sincerity and of preventing sometimes too hasty impressions of others, or errors of inconsideration which ill-designing men might unwarily engage him in; also I hoped I might have more power to do good in a more public post; so if I have descended to a lower place, as a second marriage in its own nature ever appeared to me to be . . . it was out of a too great desire to serve my Brethren; if I erred, pardon O Lord, this error and bless my endeavour . . .”

There follows a series of short aphorisms with longer paragraphs on matters of religion, morality, philosophy, etc. Elizabeth Burnet makes no pretence at original philosophic thinking, but she does ruminate in the solitude of her “closet” those deeper books and questions which she, as a duty, examined. On the whole it is the moral problems of daily life which most frequently exercise her thoughts, such as loyalty and truthfulness in friendship, being grieved to the heart at the imperfections of friends, and admonishing herself that this sorrow should arise from the love of God. The power of passion (the word is used at her time to mean emotions and feelings as well as passion), the nature of sin and desire, the question as to how saving grace may be recognized and many more theological problems are discussed. Of desire she writes in the margin: “Norris”, and then:

“If you call a subordinate desire no desire, ’tis the same with Dr. Whitcote. You desire the Creature as a means to glorify the Creator. Is it not easy to deceive yourself here? the will is the great sacrifice and when it is attuned to God it so governs our passions that they will be regular, for what(ever) everyone fancies ’tis the fault of our own will when our passions master our understanding.”

As if talking to a friend, she writes: “you expect from what you call faith, assurance and peace and joy in God; but these are not its necessary consequents; I expect you mean by

faith, a faith working by love, or the whole graces of a true Christian; but bare belief, tho' true, will not procure this confidence in God you seem to seek after . . . faith may believe the truth of an object but 'tis love only that can establish our dependence on it . . ."

On the relation between prosperity and pleasure, she writes: "prosperity has been a means by which I have done good to others, but 'tis corrections and afflictions by which I have most sensibly felt I have received good to myself. They were the happy instruments of sending me most to God."

The discussion between the Papist and the Protestant follows the usual line of the day but it is short and pithy and not unfair. Of the conflict between the Atheists and believers she says: "Why should the abuse of religion or the fancies of Enthusiasts harden the atheistical into contempt or denial of religion more than the extravagancies of fools or madmen make them deny that there is such a thing as reason?" In a prayer for truth she says: "Truth may be lost in disputations, if desire for victory prevail." And of sin: "all evils but sin are without us, we feel we can escape from them. Sin is an evil that cleaves to us, to that self-conscious principle which alone is properly *us*." After "some disputes of God's foreknowledge and Providence", she is sad "and disinclined to the doctrine of absolute decrees . . . because I could not see how they were consistent with perfect goodness", but she leaves the solution "to God's goodness which will vindicate both His perfection and attributes."

Of time and eternity she says: "Our earthly state is not properly living, we are always followed with solicitude for what is future or anxiety for what is past, so that the present moment is not possest. Heaven will be one permanent present and perfect happiness, perfect in its nature and perfect by its duration so that it will be true enjoyment because alloyed by no fear of mutation."

This preoccupation with eternity is allied to the problems of the immortality of the soul, which constantly exercised the

philosophers of that day. In the Locke letters, in the diary, in the *Method of Devotion*, there are numerous passages bearing on it. In October 1699 she tells Locke that she had spent a long period of illness at Bath considering what the Scriptures afford on the question and had prepared some papers to submit to him, and in her diary (p. 143) opposite a marginal Mr. L. she writes:

"if your notion implies an extinguishing that breath or flame of life is not [that] the same with annihilation, then life would not be resurrection but recreation: is it not more probable the spirit or principle of life exists with God and hovers in an imperfect state in expectation of a more perfect one at the Resurrection. Nor can any strong argument be drawn from the words, breath, life, soul being used only for the present life in some places, since they are used in others by those who believed and intended to express them to represent the soul as a separate substance."

On August 1, 1701, she writes, lifting the whole question to a higher plane:

"O how great is thy mercy that I am capable to love God, to have some comprehension of his perfections and some capacity of conformity, this is indeed to be, this in a manner unites to God, is a sort of participation, 'tis to dwell in God and God in us, this is life. The whole world of thought and matter is as nothing when compared to the excellency of one soul conscious of God and itself: all the pleasures of sense are low and despicable but as little streams leading to this fountain; this gives us a share in the glory of God and of all his greatness; and can such a principle so divine ever die or be extinguished? surely no."

Among other subjects that of grace and freewill also occupies her. It is clear that she had in mind the controversy of the Jansenists and Thomists on this matter. On p. 142v she decides that she has the power to use the grace in order to pray for assistance and that that prayer will not be refused, but both these things "may depend upon the operation of the Holy Spirit, yet not forcing our wills but assisting our weakness, and tho' to will and to do is of God, yet surely that is only, that effectual will of extraordinary gifts that will produce the sub-

sequent acts conformable to the good pleasure of God, and not that will, that is necessary to the freedom of our actions, which constitute vice and virtue, and is the foundation of rewards and punishments."

And then very simply she adds that this is written only to "account to myself why all are not called, for doubtless our misery is from ourselves and not from any 'arbitrie' decree of God. For were that difficulty solved I am far from advancing an opinion to rob God of the glory of his free grace, nor does the *highest free willer* (*sic*) I ever talked with, do it, since we can but receive all from God and that every creature does, and is granted by all, tho' the manner be disputed."

While it is difficult to select suitable passages from so intimate a record as Mrs. Burnet's religious aspirations, a little may be quoted on the constant moral anxiety which here and in the Locke letters she attributes to the interplay of a sick body and a sensitive mind. In 1698, when describing her ill health to Locke, and asking him to prescribe for her, she speaks much of her "melancollic" temperament during the periodic bouts of illness, and deplores the effect it has on her powers of mind. On the religious side of the question she repeatedly recognizes the value of these limitations, and shortly after the date of the Locke letter, there is in the diary a meditation on the graces and effects of illness (p. 152v). After describing the effects she experiences, she writes very charmingly of the gracious acceptance of service and gifts from loved ones, in sickness, taking care not to ask "for what is too hard for them to do, and considering the pain of a generous mind in having to refuse . . ." She quotes Malebranche on the importance of making no resolutions when "passion has disordered the mind." How careful she was herself to keep guard over her impulses and affections, may be estimated from the constant references to the subject in all her writings. In the Travel Journal there is a passage where she takes herself most severely to task for having inadvertently gone beyond the truth, in making a compliment, through her desire to please the recipient of her gift.

Indeed her natural generosity and warmheartedness led her at times into impulsive action, as her letters to Locke show. After their friendship had become established she refers confidentially to this trait; "I believe you will forgive my freedom, having given me often experience of how indulgent you are to the good-meaning errors of your . . ."

Another sphere for self-discipline Mrs. Burnet finds in the mortification of the desire for knowledge. On p. 146 she reproves herself for overmuch desire for knowledge and the instructions of the wise and learned . . . "what serves great part of what the world calls learning but to enable men more nicely to *distinguish away* the stricter precepts of true morality and teach arts to indulge imperfections in virtue, without remorse? . . ." As for herself she adds: "all that I have really learnt, tho' little enough, was from the Holy Scriptures, and on my knees in supplication to God, in a spirit of humility, recollection and meditation . . ."

We shall now pass to a consideration of this more spiritual side of Elizabeth's diary. Of her intimate outpourings to God we shall say nothing, as is meet. Here at least there is no trace of verbosity or formality, but the untrammelled outflow of heart and mind, in love unto Love.

Early in the diary there is a long entry that bears upon our inquiry as to the mode of Mrs. Burnet's prayer. It is a detailed criticism of the work and personality of Madame Bourignon. It would be hard to imagine a greater contrast than that of Elizabeth's spiritual character and that of the celebrated Antoinette Bourignon. Mrs. Burnet inherited the dislike which thinkers of her age felt for emotional or "enthusiastic" religion, but having experienced herself something of the nature of mystical prayer, she was able to recognize both the valid elements and the dangers in Mme. Bourignon's book. With her usual generosity she begins with an appraisal of "the true and noble thoughts" in the book, but then points out the reasons for error in Mme. Bourignon's analyses of her own experiences:

"a bold self-opinionativeness which nothing can excuse from a

presumptuous blasphemy and imposing on the world, but a disorder in her imagination, and that she was herself deceived by it; which I suppose was from hence, that she was of a piercing wit, lively invention and well disposed to a strict virtue and piety, yet without education or learning, she and others, finding from an application of thought, great light breaking in on her mind and a clear distinguishing of any truths of morality and natural religion, which being followed without any bias towards any party or interest, enabled her more clearly to see what was amiss in them; and having no prepositions (propositions, principles ?) from human sciences or the notions of others, followed her own reasonings without restraint; concluded that the light of her own reason so much surpassing what she saw in others, or what she thought herself capable of, was no other than a teaching given from Heaven; to which if you add the natural inclinations we all have to be extraordinary and the delusions of self-love, it will not be hard to account for most of the pretensions of Enthusiasts, without condemning them of direct imposture . . .”

There follows a further analysis of what we should now call “persecution mania.” Such a piece of psychological analysis is indeed remarkable and it presupposes a very real knowledge of more advanced states of prayer. It is possible that she owed something to the account of a spiritual life in Henry Scougal’s *Life of union with God*, which Bishop Burnet edited in 1707. And it is also possible that Mrs. Burnet, whose mother was the daughter of Dr. Bathurst, a well known London physician, may have been a relation of the notorious Mrs. Bathurst, the Philadelphian mystic, whose eccentricities and incomprehensible outpourings fill three volumes, also among the Rawlinson MSS. If Mrs. Burnet had experience of Mrs. Bathurst, it would account for her understanding of Mme. Bourignon.

In support of the presumption that Elizabeth Burnet knew something of mystical prayer, we remember the passage already quoted concerning the use of words and freedom from words in prayer. On p. 146 of the diary, in the margin, is a note “Bishop of Cambray etc.” and the passage opposite reads:

“On reading some books recommending internal piety and devotion and a spiritual life, I remember when very young so

soon as I began to think of religious matters some of these thoughts did as it were spring up in my mind, I know not how, for I found them not then in books, but my mind found rest and quiet in them and in all those paths that lead to the most perfect virtue; and when I first met with them from men of piety and learning, my heart was glad, they seemed to me old acquaintances and I feel as it were their certainty. I have sometimes been discouraged by men of other thoughts and learning, from this inward way and have neglected to attend to it but I have never lost by it; for sure, guided by humility, 'tis the way to truth and holiness. O let me never more depart from thee, O Lord ! ”

Many a word and line of her work indicates that she had read some of the best Catholic spiritual authors on the interior life, but this with St. Teresa, in the *Travel Journal*, is the only mention of a specific name. Two other passages deserve quotation. On p. 149 occurs a petition for the graces of devotion granted to those who attend church on Sundays, with a rebuke to those who “try to deprive the poor and miserable of their consolations by pouring scorn on the place of emotion in religion.” She continues :

“From whence, O Lord, come these great and unutterable pleasures of devotion when the mind getting as it were out of the body, it contemplates thy perfections and thy promises ? I am sure the senses have no part in this joy as they bring no material for it, neither by sight, taste nor smell is gratified by it, and yet I perceive something more full and satisfying than any pleasure arising from them, surely this must spring from a real suitableness of these employments to a rational soul, and as that is a real Being separable from the senses, so there is really a state hereafter more suited to the nature of the soul and more capable to make it happy than what it possess here.”

And on p. 156v :

“at some recollected moments I have had my thoughts all aflame and full of the love of God and divine things; the sweetness that accompanies such a temper is beyond expression. When dullness succeeds, I strive to recollect these meditations and ransack my memory for them, but this is but time lost, for it was not the words or thoughts but the Spirit that gave life to the words that without it are but dead. Whether these are from a divine or a natural cause I will not presume to aver, but if they are manifestations from that light in which alone we see light,

he can give them again, or others as bright and clear, and all we have to do is to keep our minds pure and calm and fit to receive truth and light, and 'tis to distrust his favour and assistance to lose so much time to recall past meditations or representations as if we . . ."

Here the diary breaks off.

This is indeed witness to experience beyond ordinary religious devotion, and qualified by her frequent warnings against mere sensibility, "a warm devotion that much mixes with the passions . . .", may be regarded as a proof of that "heavenly-mindedness" of which her husband, the bishop, spoke. This knowledge is the true fruit of the earlier years of asceticism, which may have cost her her health, but gained her a participation in the joys that throughout the ages, and in all forms of Christianity, have been the reward of faithfully loving souls

THE LOCKE LETTERS.

We turn now to the Locke correspondence. We have already referred to the first letter written in 1696 when Elizabeth Berkeley was still a widow, and the greater number of the letters we have belong to this period.

Locke apparently answered her question. We know he had just published the *Vindication of the Truth of Christianity*, which caused some adverse criticism. Edward Stillingfleet, Bishop of Worcester, had also attacked passages in his *Essay on the Human Understanding*, and Locke replied in a pamphlet, which Mrs. Burnet now comments upon in two letters of 1697. She is much concerned at the conflict of her two friends, both Churchmen, and faithful Christians according to their own lights. Her first argument is that Locke should refrain from attacking slips in the bishop's text knowing that he is a great scholar and above tricks of deliberate bad faith. She also suggests that Locke would not suffer in his reputation if he refrained from continuing the controversy in the interests of charity. It appears that her advice was not taken, and later we have a long document, enclosed in a letter, discussing Locke's points one by one and endeavouring to reconcile his views with

those of the bishop. Among other arguments she points out that the bishop had in mind, not so much Locke's ideas in the "Essay" as the erroneous use others would make of his principles (a view that was soon to be abundantly justified).

The criticism Mrs. Burnet sent was extremely outspoken while admitting constantly her own ignorance in matters of "speculation", and her pleasure "with the sincerity and good temper of mind that is visible in all your writings." Such is her confidence in truth and disinterestedness that she does not hesitate to write:

"If your way of proving and knowing is found a clear and easy method it will be approved and used when time has smashed the prejudices and stilled the fears of its opposers, and if it is not so and only shows the promised land of knowledge but brings not to it, it will like former schemes, fall into disuse of itself; for my own part I have this objection against your book, that it seems to make the ways of speculation so plain and easy as tempts into those mazes where the unskilled lose themselves, so that perhaps, the placing needless 'barocadoes' at the entrance of knowledge is no more than necessary to afright all unarmed and weak persons from presuming to approach."

From the next letter (13 Oct., 1697) we gather that Locke read and considered her criticism. There was perhaps in his reply a certain acerbity which Elizabeth, in her charitable discernment, interprets as arising not out of wounded self-pride, but out of his fear that he had incurred her displeasure.

"I am so fully persuaded of the integrity of your intentions (and shall not easily change my mind) that there needs no care or thought to justify yourself to me . . . but my concern for your being not misunderstood, is for others not myself; I conclude your aim is to make people better and wiser and hope you will remember the world is made up mostly of children in the worst sense, who must be flattered to their duty by seeming to believe they do it . . ."

And she reproaches herself bitterly for having by her ignorance, even with the best intentions, exacerbated the unfortunate dispute between her two friends. It cannot have been easy to conciliate such sensitive disputants as Stillingfleet and Locke, and the bishop, it appears, also took her to task, explaining that she had misrepresented him. But Elizabeth was above self-

centred feeling and pursued her humble, upright way in regard to both her friends, undismayed.

A whole year goes by before the next letter of 21 Sept., 1698. Locke had been ill and she had refrained from disturbing him. But she, too, had been more than usually ill, and now asks if he will undertake to prescribe for her. She describes her condition which was regarded as consumption. Evidently he replied speedily for on 22 Nov., 1697 we have a grateful and amusing epistle showing that he had taken her in hand body and mind, almost after the manner of a religious director. He had bidden her cut down her reading to cure her "melancolly", to which she replies that she reads very little but spends much time reflecting. "'tis seeing and reflecting on the faults and follies of mankind, and my own in the first rank, that has not only been uneasy to my mind but perhaps injurious to my health; if I have been thoughtful 'tis for what I observe in practice but could not account for in speculation. I do not at all repine at my defective health if my mind has at all gained thereby . . ." She says she will submit to all his other prescriptions as to a penance, except about reading! "I wonder how you could send me so severe a penance. I think I have a very sincere will, tho' no other quality to entitle me to the benefit of your friendship, yet I find I could not willingly give up the many valuable fruits of your meditations to have assured you (of) a more perfect tho' less useful health."

There she was called away to visit a sick friend, and on her return she found that he had sent a messenger with a copy of his second reply to the Bishop of Worcester's second pamphlet.

"So I will conclude your advice was not positive nor universal, this is at least a dispensation of your own appointing; I have but lookt into it yet but my first leisure shall be to read it as carefully as my little judgment will permit me to do; I am sure it will be both informing and entertaining, but I will not promise it shall never make me mellancolly; not from the obscurity newness or dangers of any opinions I may meet with, less from any wrong impressions for the esteemed Author, but out of grief of finding two persons so capable of thinking truly and consequently of thinking alike, so seemingly opposite to each

other; these are some of the sharpest and unaccountable infelicities of life, and must be patiently submitted to till being freed from the entanglements of interest, self-love and prejudice, we shall be better disposed for the receiving of truth and practice of charity, that you and I (and I know not where to end (?) my wish) may find some place in those mansions of truth and peace, is the hope and humble desire of your greatly obliged and truly faithful servant, Elizabeth Berkely." (22 Nov. 97. Lincoln Inn's Field.)

During the next years there are only a few letters. They both were frequently ill and Elizabeth remains constantly apprehensive lest her correspondence be taking too much time from his other important occupations. He had been living in the household of Lord Ashley, and on one occasion she writes of a "very dessarving young lady with a good fortune" whom she proposes as a suitable match "for my Lord Ashley", but we hear no more of this.

In Oct., '99 she writes from Bath where she had been spending six months after very severe ill-health, and having no books but her Bible, set to work to discover what the Scriptures really said of the Resurrection of the Body, and relates this to the last conversation they had had in town on the state of the soul after death. She put down her reflections but refrained from sending them, "tho' indeed could I hope that by turning your thoughts so long to this subject, they (my thoughts) were capable of accidentally giving you any new reflection on the side of truth . . ." From the next communication it appears that he had told her to send the papers, but illness had intervened and she admitted her own diffidence in sending them.

The friendship was now mutual, for Mrs. Berkeley frequently refers to his generosity to her and others, his constant reassurance of his esteem for her and for her "understanding and mental gifts." This fundamentally humble woman was afflicted with the torments of self-depreciation and refers often to her "mellancolly" which Locke quite specifically connected with the recurring bouts of illness.

Just before her second marriage she writes, on April 4, 1700:

"I own myself grown hardy enough to find a delight in asking as well as receiving instructions; I have had such experience of your consideration and gentleness to the ignorant (owning themselves such) that the uneasiness apt to arise from the shame of being mistaken or the fear of censure is quite overborne by the satisfaction as well as the advantage of being better informed; I find almost as little reluctance in exposing the weakness of my mind as the defects in my health, because the same charity I find disposed without severity to amend both."

Referring to the notes on the New Testament, she says:

"thank God I am not uneasily curious about what is obscurely revealed either with respect to what is future or in other matters above our clear and full comprehension; I look on the Scripture more as a rule of life in order to a future and better state, then a designed information of the nature of that happiness."

When she next writes the date is 17 March, 1700/1, and the signature, Elizabeth Burnet, but there is never any reference to her marriage. It appears that Locke had mislaid the papers last mentioned and she begs that, since he appeared unwilling to afford her the pleasure of his criticism, which she durst not press for, he would at least return the papers if he laid hands on them. She feared that he might have apprehended the opinion which her friends might have had on his thoughts, and assures him she would have kept them to herself though indeed "my friends have so fast an esteem of you that no harm would have come of it."

The next year we find her begging him, in the bishop's name as well as her own, to stay at Salisbury on his way to the house of a mutual friend. The invitation was several times repeated but Locke was by now too ill and remained at Oates. It must have been a comfort to Mrs. Burnet to know that in the last months before his death in 1704, being unable to attend church, he very frequently received the Sacrament at home at the hands of the parish priest.

The last two letters concern a lady, Catherine Trotter, playwright and philosopher, who had just written a defence of Locke and was in difficult circumstances. Mrs. Burnet recommends her to Locke, giving her reasons for her own inability to

do as much for her as she would have wished, for reasons arising out of the lady's conversion to Romanism and her association with "idle company" in pursuit of her playwright's profession. It must not be thought that there was any lack of charity on her part, her husband's status had to be considered and it seems that the lady in question had behaved rather ungraciously in casting ridicule in public "on some who had talked ('very gently' inserted) with her on the heads of religion . . . however it would not disturb me did not other reasons create a shyness", which, until further observation of her real nature, "cant be laid aside. What good offices I can do . . . I will endeavour with prudence." On the back of this letter Locke notes a date of his reply, Nov. 14 as was his orderly custom, but before it could get to her, she came posting up to town, in some agitation, and sent him a note dated Nov. 10. She had come especially to see him concerning the lady:

"I am in town and that out of my concern that you should be misled in nothing, (I) was more severe in my character than I ought to have been; one argument for the person is her great poverty, so that if you please to order me to give her or send her yourself 4 or 5 gns. it will be a welcome charity; I have assisted her a little and believe you will forgive my freedom having given me often experience how indulgent you are to the good meaning errors of your . . ."

This is the last of the Locke letters, and on this characteristic note of graciousness, simple confidence and unbounded charity of heart we must leave Elizabeth Burnet.

The pages of the diary and journal, the dialogue and letters contain many other interesting passages on subjects beyond those we have touched upon, but everything is brought to the test of the Christian faith as she had experienced it. Her great passion is to convert others to the ideals which she holds herself to have so imperfectly followed. The reader is not deceived by her humility; only a very high standard and abundant gifts of victorious grace could account for this outpouring of fruitful thought and devout prayer. The witness of her friends after her death to her sanctity, her charity and loveliness, to her humility, her spirituality, and her high mental attainments are

indeed no examples of vain eulogy: all her writings concur in offering overwhelming testimony that in Elizabeth Burnet all the best qualities of seventeenth-century England come to life, a farewell before the eighteenth century, a posy of late flowering blossoms, gathered on a winter's day, pressed and preserving their fragrance, in the pages of long forgotten manuscripts.

MIRACLE, RELATIVITY, AND NATURAL LAW

By H. O. JENKINS

CONSIDERABLE interest has arisen once again in the authenticity and character of the Gospel miracles. Walt Whitman wrote, "Why, who makes much of a miracle? As to me I know of nothing else but miracles". Or as Laurence Housman puts it, "Find something that isn't a miracle, you'll have cause to wonder then". There is profound truth in these statements. To many a poet, mystic and idealistic philosopher, the common things and events of life are infused with spirit and are revelations of God. Such men are at one with the scientist in regarding as intolerable any dualism of nature and supernature. But we must not confuse the issue. The Gospel miracles have usually been regarded as special signs of divine power, and as marvellous events outside the laws of cause and effect. Among recent books which throw light on this subject may be mentioned: (1) *Religion and Science*, by Alfred O'Rahilly, President of University College, Cork (The Standard, Dublin); (2) *William Temple, His Life and Letters*, by F. A. Iremonger (O.U.P.), especially the chapter on the Archbishop's philosophy by D. Emmet; (3) *Is Christianity Credible?*, by T. Nicklin, late Warden of Hulme Hall, University of Manchester; (4) *The Rise of Christianity*, by Bishop E. W. Barnes (Longmans); (5) *The Resurrection Pattern*, by Geoffrey Hoyland, a volume in the Colet Library of Modern Christian Thought and Teaching, edited by the Dean of St. Paul's (Duckworth).

President O'Rahilly expounds the official Roman Catholic point of view on miracle defined as a direct intervention of God

superseding secondary causes. A distinction is made between the so-called ecclesiastical miracles and the marvels related in the Gospels. Catholics are free to reject any of the former and are under no obligation to accept a miracle simply because it is related in the lessons of the Breviary, in the Martyrology, in the life of a saint, or even in a Bull of Canonization. The cures of Lourdes may also be regarded as coming within this natural category. In this ecclesiastical category, it is conceded that God may utilize natural causes or higher spiritual laws, but it is derogatory to refuse him that power of intervention possessed by the free-will of man. No freedom to reject the Gospel miracles exists for those of the Roman obedience, since all are part of the deposit of faith. Here secondary causes play no part, and no distinction can be legitimately made between the acts of healing and the nature miracles. However, Catholics are convinced by the evidence for their authority even before accepting the supernatural authority of the Church.

William Temple started with the conception of the Mind and Purpose of God as personal. To act by unalterable rules, he stated, is not characteristic of personal mind and wisdom. God's constancy of purpose is maintained by adapting the mode of activity as best fits the actual situation. The explanation of a miracle is the same as the ultimate explanation of the most commonplace event, but all events are not equally revelatory of the divine character. A miracle, then, is special action with divine revelation. No one can quarrel with this view of miracles so far as ultimate explanations are concerned, but, as Miss Dorothy Emmet points out, the theologian challenges the scientist and historian if he claims that "proximate" explanations cannot be found in other causes.

Mr. Nicklin refuses to make deductions from the nature of God or the deity of Christ, considering it more prudent to use the inductive method and to examine the historical evidence. When this is done, it is said that it becomes clear that the Gospel signs are not miracles in the sense of being marvellous events above the forces of nature and outside the ordinary naturalistic scheme, but rather wonders which have by today

largely come within the range of modern science. As long ago as the fourth century, St. Augustine declared that miracles were not contrary to nature, but to what was known about nature. Thus what appears to be a miracle to one age may be perfectly natural to another. Again, the author asserts that the Scriptures make no claim to record causeless miracles, events emanating directly from God. They speak only about signs and wonders, and these can happen without their being preternatural or causeless. At the beginning of his Ministry, Jesus rejected the temptation to defy the laws of nature. Fulfilling his mission within the ambit of his Father's will, he impressed upon all that it was the Father who worked in him. Mr. Nicklin points out that medical missionaries in Africa have found it necessary to impress upon natives that cures are not magical or miraculous, but rather normal effects of well-known remedies.

Much has been written suggesting that the Bishop of Birmingham reaffirms the old view that miracles considered as breaches of objective natural law cannot happen. However, Dr. Barnes does not definitely say this. He is a believer in the Creation, and also considers it likely that divine creative activity goes on continuously in the realm of infinitesimals, evidently because of the use of the notion of probability in quantum physics. Adopting the pragmatic point of view, he accepts the unprovable finite scale uniformity of nature, because, as all admit, it has been of such immense power and value in scientific research. Yet the miraculous stories of the New Testament, in this scholar's opinion, have little factual basis, beautiful, attractive, moving, singularly appropriate to the teaching of Christ though they be. Apart from those incidents, which can be given other explanations, they are allegories or fanciful pictures. They are, in fact, the great music of the Christian tradition. As Dr. W. R. Inge has reminded us, "they have helped many to cross from the visible to the invisible world and back again". "Here we see by means of symbols as in a mirror".

Mr. Hoyland subscribes to Professor A. N. Whitehead's dictum, "A clash of doctrines is not a disaster; it is an opportunity". Drs. Barnes and O'Rahilly in different ways sharply

divide the Gospel miracles and science. Mr. Hoyland, who has much in common with Mr. Nicklin, seeks so to enlarge and re-interpret science as to include them. His short popular book suggests how ideas from Einstein's theories of relativity with their holistic outlook and elimination of force-laws from scientific thinking, may help the ordinary man to a Christian faith by which he can live in intellectual honesty. This author does not advocate an uncritical acceptance of all miracle stories, but considers that belief in some is essential to the Christianity of the ages. His interpretation of miracle based on relativity will be considered later. That scientific theories have exerted an important influence on subsequent philosophical and religious thought can hardly be doubted; the mechanics and astronomy of the Renaissance, Newtonian gravitational theory, the doctrine of evolution, Planck's quantum theory, and Eddington's epistemological science furnish illustrations of ideas which have left their impress on fields other than those in which they originated. In the philosophical synthetic type of mind, this interaction and intermingling of ideas and principles from divers forms of human experience continually takes place, and is sometimes a stage on the way towards the formation of a *philosophia prima* or coherent view of the world.

The legitimacy of the miracle, "faith's dearest child", has caused much perplexity along the centuries. In the *Report on Doctrine in the Church of England*, page 51, to which Temple contributed, we read, "A miracle, if it occurs, is not a breach of order, but expresses the purpose of God, which also determines the order of nature. But an event is rightly called a miracle in so far as it is a work of God's power and holiness and cannot be co-ordinated with the general scheme of the Universe by means of the ordinary categories of science alone, or even of those ordinarily required for the interpretation of human action". It will be noticed that this ambiguous definition states that a miracle is not a breach of order but at the same time is outside the scientific scheme. Now Newton and his successors were considered to have demonstrated the closed character of the Universe which had an unbreakable rationality

of its own, independent of any spiritual order. Later, Hume maintained in his *Essay on Miracles* that there can never be any adequate historical evidence for such events. This philosopher also rejected the principle of induction, which would make all science impossible. Traditional Christianity resting on and mainly concerned with the dogma of the infallibility of Scripture, or faith in the general reliability of its documents, has usually asserted that God governs the world by occasional *coups d'état*, although many scientists and theologians alike refuse to intercalate acts of God among laws of nature. As the *Report on Doctrine* affirms, there is a religious as well as a scientific motive at work here, since some feel it to be more congruous with the wisdom and majesty of God that the laws of nature without exception should serve his glorious purpose. Charles Gore (among others) considered that a complete rejection of the miraculous element in the Gospels would leave little that is coherent and trustworthy behind. This is probably true although Bishop Barnes denies it. It will be suggested later that considerably less need be rejected than some imagine. Gore also believed that the question of the miraculous was bound up with the question of freedom in man. If man can deliberate and within certain limits choose and determine his course of action, then it is impossible to deny to the Supreme Spirit the same freedom for exceptional action. Many answers can be given to this type of contention. Thus, while no one doubts the possibility, it is the reality of divine interference with the laws of nature which is the problem. Again if Bishop Barnes is right, the free creative activity of the personal God is shown in the infinitesimal realm, which leaves intact the finite scale uniformity of nature.

Dominated by the concepts, "law of nature" and "uniformity of nature", the general view in the nineteenth century was that miracles as then understood, and as Dr. O'Rahilly still understands them, could not possibly happen. These conclusions were not legitimate and some thinkers of those days were well aware of the limitations of such ideas. To read the theological and philosophical essays of James Martineau is to grasp

this fact immediately. Karl Pearson in his *Grammar of Science* pointed out that generalizations from experience are not made with certainty. Indeed to say that they are involves the fallacy known in logic as the undistributed middle term. Professor Polyani has written recently, "The propositions of science thus appear to be in the nature of guesses, . . . they are subject to a process of verification in the light of further observations, . . . but their conjectural character remains inherent in them". The principle of the uniformity of nature has already been referred to as an unprovable dogma. J. S. Mill tried to prove it but his argument is circular. The faith of scientists in this great principle is sometimes subject to considerable strain. In 1922, Mark and Polyani found that when tin crystals were strained in the form of wire, a set of slip lines appeared on their surfaces. Photographs were published by these workers, and identical photographs published by Burger, an independent experimenter. However in 1923, the same procedure failed to give slip bands, and no explanation was ever found for the changed behaviour. Faith asserts that some unknown factor has entered. Uniformity of behaviour is the working hypothesis of science, and the rationality of the Universe is accepted on trust. As Whitehead has written, "there can be no living science unless there is a widespread instinctive conviction in the existence of . . . an Order of Nature".

Shortly before his death, Dr. C. J. Cadoux wrote, "No incident which is not self-contradictory can, in the present state of our knowledge, be pronounced impossible or inconceivable". Those who read literature devoted to psychoanalysis and psychical research will receive this statement with agreement. We live in a strange world, and the depths and powers of mind are only beginning to be suspected. To say the least, the incidents related in the Gospels involved the active participation of a mind of unusual character. Indeed it is much to be hoped that one of the results of psychical research will be to encourage a new attitude on the part of New Testament scholars to abnormal events within their province of study. We know that earlier critical studies, ruled by the supposed scientific

necessity of the day, and by a false intuition of the limits of the credible, relegated a fair proportion of the Gospels to the realms of fancy, illusion, or legend. Dr. Hunkin said recently, "Some of the original stories have probably been embroidered by piety, some may be *ben trovato* rather than literally historical, others . . . may be regarded as Christian Midrash rather than authentic history". Conservative thinkers have felt that once the abnormal events in the life of Jesus were removed, the residue must be suspect by reason of its association with so much doubtful matter. But although a great deal of standard criticism still stands, the situation has altered as a result of sixty years of psychical research. The study of the abysmal depths of human personality, telepathy, clairvoyance, materialization, so called spirit healing, psycho-kinesis—these surely suggest that the limits of the credible were too narrowly drawn in the past. The gospels are seen to abound in supernormal phenomena, and Jesus undoubtedly possessed marked telepathic and possibly clairvoyant and precognitive powers.

If telepathic ability is connected with the absence of repressive mechanisms in the subconscious, the perfection and moral grandeur of our Lord's Person might indeed be expected to display it. The statement in St. Luke, that the sun was darkened and the veil of the temple rent, may rest on fancy, but the healing incident in the fourth chapter of St. John affecting the nobleman's son who was at a considerable distance from Jesus, is now seen to be possible. Indeed, it can hardly be categorically denied that Jesus walked on the water and changed water into wine—provided the historians are satisfied. The New Testament narratives are assuming a new reliability and can be read with a deeper appreciation. The historian must be granted the importance he has always claimed. As the seventeenth-century writer, Dr. Joseph Glanvill, remarked, "Matters of fact well proved ought not to be denied because we cannot conceive how they can be performed. Nor is it a reasonable method of inference, first to presume a thing impossible, and thence to conclude that the fact cannot be proved. On the contrary, we should judge of the action by the evidence, and not of the evidence

by the measures of our fancies about the action ". Again, when historical criticism has established the probable authenticity of an unusual event, every attempt must be made to link it up with other phenomena, and to explain its occurrence in terms of ordinary (possibly modified) principles and categories, in the same way as the novel facts of modern psychical research are slowly being fitted into the patterns of psychology and physiology, although not without considerable modification in the existing patterns of these.

Some considerable progress has already been made along these lines. The acts of healing, including those involving telepathy, which are well attested and are to be found in Q and L, the oldest Gospel material we possess, can be approximately paralleled by the cures of the psychologist, psychoanalyst, and spiritual healer. Mr. Nicklin writes, " Of the disorders recorded to have been cured, most would be classed as of the neurasthenic or psychasthenic types which psychiatry has been found able to control. Even the specially serious case of the paranoiac youth may be thought to have been such as would be amenable to this kind of treatment. Cutaneous and ophthalmic maladies are susceptible to the effects of strong emotion and excitement. A blind man, it is credibly related, was healed by the Emperor Vespasian. Hetero-suggestion and tactual manipulation can powerfully reinforce the healing operation of auto-suggestion ". Remarkable cures of infantile paralysis, blindness, etc., by so-called spirit healers have recently been reported in the Press. Harry Edwards, of Burrows Lea, Surrey, is reported to have cured a little girl Christine Sparham of Aveley, Essex, who had been almost blind from birth. The procedure seems to have been tactual manipulation with suggestion. Psychical research has also thrown light on the *modus operandi* of the Resurrection Appearances of Jesus, while in no way denying the objective reality of our Lord's spiritual existence. It seems probable that they were telepathic phenomena with the spirit of Jesus as the originating source.

Study has shown that the agent of the hallucination is usually undergoing some crisis, while the percipient generally

has some emotional linkage with him or her. The percipient may simply feel that the agent is in the room, or the hallucination may become visual and a figure be seen. A full discussion of this field would require a preliminary consideration of the modern theory of sense perception. It can only be said that it is now believed that apparitions are the sensory expression of dramatic constructs created in mid-level regions of the personality outside the field of normal consciousness. The "nature miracles" are more intractable, and in some instances, such as the crowd feedings and the withering of the fig tree, can be given other reasonable explanations. Others may well be facts of history, and the existence of accounts of similar incidents in folk-lore is no argument against this truth. As already stated, the powers of mind are incompletely understood, and in this connexion Dr. J. B. Rhine's book, *The Reach of the Mind*, which deals with psycho-kinesis, should be studied. Here it is claimed that certain persons, by a mere act of will, can overcome the inertia of a falling die and cause it to land with an assigned face upwards more often than chance requires. Scores are tested by the standard formulae of the calculus of probabilities, and significantly high and low totals reported with the same set of dice. If mind is able to produce such changes in the angular momentum of gross matter, it may not be beyond its power to produce the various nuclear and electronic movements necessary to change water into other substances. Naturally the old-fashioned "argument from miracles" has lost its evidential value. The supernormal phenomena do not necessarily compel belief in the uniqueness of the revelation, but they are congruous with Christian belief in the profound spiritual capacities of its Lord.

The history of the disastrous cleavage between science and religion which took place in the last century has been told many times. Mr. Hoyland, who is equally concerned for scientific and religious truth, draws attention to one cause—the Victorian inherited conception of compulsive laws of nature. Newton, himself, is said to have regarded the Universe as an arena of conflicting forces acting on an inherently resisting matter. A

miracle was then regarded as the intolerable intrusion of an over-riding force outside the realm of natural law, and its possibility was assumed to be zero. The greatness of Newton is not likely to be underestimated. Since his day, his four primitive, highly general laws have been found sufficient to account for almost all motions in the solar system and distant binary stars. His basic principles remained practically unaltered until the advent of Einstein's revolutionary theories. It will be of interest to trace the rise of relativity. Einstein completed the Special Theory during the years 1905-07, and the General Theory during the years 1907-15. Later developments were announced in 1929. The special theory is that of the relativity of uniform motion, motion being change of position with time, and position being relative to a frame of reference. Newton conceived of space as an infinite three-dimensional continuum independent of objects immersed in it; time was a one-dimensional continuum which flowed uniformly and relentlessly. On the basis of this rigid framework for mechanical phenomena, space distances and time lapses were considered absolute. Then in the nineteenth century there developed a clash between Newtonian mechanics and electromagnetic theory, which was resolved by Einstein along the lines of showing the relative nature of space and time intervals. Using Hegelian terminology, classical mechanics was the thesis, electromagnetic theory the antithesis, and the special theory the synthesis. Later Minowski discovered that relativity could be formulated with the aid of a four-dimensional geometry, the point-event in the new concept of space-time being the element of physical reality. The General Theory applies to all reference systems whatever their motion. Relative to a non-accelerated system, the path of a particle acted on by no forces is a straight line, but if we refer the motion to a co-ordinate system accelerated with respect to the first, the path is no longer straight. A geometrical transformation is seen to be equivalent to a gravitational field. Physics is reduced to geometry but the geometry is non-Euclidean. Gravitational force becomes a metrical property of space-time. The idea of gravitational attraction is unnecessary, and the movement of an

apple to the earth, or the moon in its orbit is but the tracing of its natural path or geodesic in a curved region of space-time. More recently, attempts have been made by Weyl, Eddington and Einstein to transform electromagnetism into a metrical property of space-time. To-day Professor Milne is a serious critic of relativity, for notwithstanding its successes, he considers it to be philosophically unsatisfactory.

Mr. Hoyland believes that Newton himself was in the habit of projecting crude anthropomorphic ideas of effort and resistance, compulsion and yielding, into the physical world. This is doubtful, for some scholars have said that when the scientist wrote in the *Principia*, *hypotheses non fingo*, he meant that such ideas were not to be taken seriously. But it is certain that the successors of Newton were as guilty of anthropomorphism as the writer of the second chapter of Genesis. The unconscious philosophy of men of science was, and indeed very largely is, one of crude realism. However, during the nineteenth century came a revival of interest in the philosophy of science, and Mach, the Austrian physicist and philosopher, Karl Pearson and others attempted to convert this naïve realism into phenomenalism. In particular, Mach called attention to the philosophical basis of mechanics, contending that this science aims simply at describing the motions of bodies and has no concern with causes. His programme included the elimination of all tautologous propositions and unverifiable concepts and ideas. Einstein and Milne have carried this epistemological method of discovery much further. The ideas of Mach were not new for he owed much to Locke, Hume and Kant, but they bewildered his unphilosophical colleagues, and were either rejected or ignored. Thus we see that before the advent of relativity, Mach and his followers recognized the forces of Newtonian theory as convenient fictions. More recently Cassirer has stressed the essential non-representative character of the symbolism used in science, stating that in so far as concepts of "thing" or "cause" are still used, we are embodying relics of mythical thinking. Mr. Hoyland rightly stresses the part played by Einstein, who continued the work of Mach, in substituting for force-laws, defining

what matter must do, pattern-laws, defining the geometry of space-time, and indicating how in fact matter does behave. This leads to his conclusion with regard to miracles: "... the idea of miracles has been banished from relativity thinking for good and all; so long as natural law was conceived as the expression of the way matter must behave, miracles were possible, for matter like a naughty schoolboy might kick over the traces under some sudden compulsion, but with the new conception of pattern-law, as a statement of the way matter does behave, miracles have gone by the board, since in no circumstances can matter behave in a way it does not behave". Like Temple, Hoyland believes that the abnormal events related in the Gospels are not to be looked upon as "*ad hoc* instances of God's arbitrary dispensing power", for relativity has introduced into science the holistic outlook and rejects the idea of epiphenomena. *The Resurrection Pattern* will raise many questions but will certainly repay a careful reading.

Although not discussed in *The Resurrection Pattern*, a far more profound revolution in physics than the elimination of forces, also initiated by Mach and Einstein, can be briefly mentioned. They inaugurated the epistemological method of discovery, which was urged later by Bridgeman, played a great part in Heisenberg's formulation of quantum mechanics, and has culminated in the attempts of Eddington and Milne to derive natural laws and the universal constants of nature from the premisses of reason and the subjective requirements of the human mind. It will be remembered that Kant suggested that it ought to be possible to build up science from inborn *a priori* knowledge. Eddington and Milne also believe this, except that the *a priori* knowledge is to be looked upon as epistemological rather than inborn. "Objective" laws of nature have been referred to earlier in this article. However, many physical propositions which have been thought to record purely objective facts, appear to correspond in reality to the sensory and intellectual equipment of men, and so must be, at least in part, subjective. From a detailed consideration of such sensory and intellectual equipment, Eddington claimed to be able to deduce cer-

tain fundamental laws and constants of nature previously thought to rest on an experimental basis. For example, Eddington has derived the mass ratio of the proton and electron as the ratio of the two roots of a certain equation. Again Milne, without recourse to experience, has obtained the inverse square law of gravitation and the laws of dynamics, which to Newton were pure hypotheses. For Descartes, the laws of nature were deducible from the nature of God, while for the new science, they are deducible from the peculiarities of the human brain and mind. Also Eddington believes that since fundamental laws are epistemological, they have an altogether different kind of certainty from those reached by inductive generalization of experimental results. There can be no exceptions to them.

What is the bearing of all this on miracles? If we agree with what seems reasonable, that the particular form which we give to the laws of nature depends on our physical and mental make-up, it does not alter the fact that God governs the world through law. The loophole mentioned in an earlier section based on the lack of certainty attached to inductive generalizations also seems to be disappearing. Finally the new developments emphasize the close kinship of the mind of man with the physical universe, the rationality of the world, and that its unity must be more fundamental than its diversity.

THE CHARACTER OF AN OLD ENGLISH PURITANE, OR NONCONFORMIST—JOHN GEREЕ

EDITED BY MAURICE HUSSEY

JOHN Gereе, author of this tract, was born in Yorkshire in 1601, and educated at Magdalen Hall, Oxford, where he proceeded M.A. in 1621. Ordained, he became a Church-Puritan, a relic of Elizabethan nonconformity, of the school of the Old Puritane to which he looks back in this study of their manners and habits. It was in Tewkesbury, a Puritan area, that he was to make his mark, and after but three years to be silenced. His years of inactivity, which lasted till 1641, are marked by ecclesiastical inquiries into the actions of these ministers throughout the Anglican Church. At one inquiry (reported in *Cases in the Star Chamber and High Commission* ed. S. R. Gardiner, Camden Society, 1886) it was stated that Gereе "was the man upon whose preaching one at Tewkesbury threw himself into a well and drowned himself", and that he was reproved by Laud for "wearing such a band so curiously sett and too bigg", when the habit of the Precisian included a small ruff, and the Laudian "weareth a little band, a long cassock, a little larger than his Cloake, a fine holliock for his girdle . . . he loveth little bands, short haire, grave looks" (*Hierurgia Anglicana*, II, p. 250). A personal description of Gereе we owe to *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic*, Charles I, 1639/40, p. 582: "Geery, the canny, mumping fellow with the red head . . . (belonging to) that pack of either deprived, silenced, or puritanically affected men." Tewkesbury was a noted centre, and on that same page

we find the case of an inhabitant, Fox, and his sons, Help-on-High and Sion-build. When at last Geree was restored, he stayed five years and then removed to St. Albans, in 1646, and to St. Faith's under St. Paul's where his sermons were widely attended.

His Conservative and Royalist nature showed not only in his pamphlets, but also at the close of his life, in February 1649, at the death of Charles, a coincidence that was noticed by Richard Baxter, when he named him "Geery that died at the news of the King's death" in his *Apology for the Nonconformist's Ministry* (1681). Even this fact reminds us that we are in a different world from that of the Cromwellians, and that this Royalism hails from the days of Elizabeth and finds further expression in the poetry of Andrew Marvell. The true spiritual brethren of Geree are Cambridge men, William Perkins and Arthur Dent, both of Christ's College. His tract together with their writings offer the best documentation of the chapter "Puritan Domestic Life", in Professor M. M. Knappen's *Tudor Puritanism* (Chicago, 1939). No further critical commentary is necessary to illumine the social and religious habits which are described below.

Another tract of some note proceeded from Geree's pen. This was *A Case of Conscience*, in which he set out to show how the King might refrain from upholding the episcopate in the paramount interest of peace in the realm. It is one with the rest of his writing. His request for peace in life and worship may surprise those for whom the Puritan is merely the fanatic. Yet underneath the surface of the Puritanism of the history textbooks, there were these believers with their family prayers and countless sermons—another world picture to be preferred to that current with its more superficial flashes and attractions. Those who seek a brief and quotable account of this older way of life will find it in this quiet and insistent exhortation.

The text here reprinted has been taken from the edition of 1646, by kind permission of the Librarian of the University Library, Cambridge. The British Museum possesses four

copies of editions appearing in 1646, 1649 and 1672. Extracts were printed in William Urwick's *Nonconformity in Herts* (1884) and, coincidentally, while this was in preparation there appears *John Bunyan, L'Homme et L'Oeuvre*, by Dr. H. A. Talon (Paris, 1948) which quotes a few phrases. The spelling of the original has been preserved with one necessary expansion; it has not been practicable to preserve the appearance of the original, which as a Biblical *cento* is full of marginal chapter references. The notes have been added by the editor, who wishes to acknowledge the assistance of Professor Bruce Dickins in the preparation of the text and the Rev. Geoffrey Soden for his great kindness in allowing a section of his *Life of Bishop Goodwin* to be used before its publication, and incidentally rescuing Goodwin from the charge, printed in D.N.B., *sub* Gereë, of persecuting the inoffensive author of this tract.

The Character of an old
ENGLISH PURITANE,
OR
NON-CONFORMIST¹

(By JOHN GEREË, M.A.)

A2

THE Old English Puritane was such an one, that honoured God above all, and under God gave every one his due. His first care was to serve God, and therein he did not what was good in his owne, but in Gods sight, making the word of God the rule of his worship. He highly esteemed order in the House of God: but would not under colour of that submit to superstitious rites, which are superfluous, and perish in their use. He revered Authority keeping within its sphære: but durst not under pretence of subjection to the higher powers, wor-

¹ LONDON / Printed by *W. Wilson* for *Christopher Meredith* / at the Crane in *Paul's Churchyard*, 1646.

A2v.

ship God after the traditions of men. Hee made conscience of all Gods ordinances, though some hee esteemed of more consequence. Hee was much in prayer; with it he began, and closed the day. In it hee was exercised in his closet, family, and publike assembly. He esteemed that manner of prayer best, whereby the gift of Gods expressions were varied according to present wants and occasions; yet did he not account set formes unlawfull. Therefore in that circumstance of the Church he did not wholly reject the Liturgy, but the corruption of it. He esteemed reading of the word an ordinance of God both in private and publike; but did not account reading to be preaching. The word read he esteemed of more authority, but the word preache of more efficacy. He accounted preaching as necessary now as in the Primitive Church: Gods pleasure being still by the foolishnesse of preaching to save those that beleeve. He esteemed that preaching best wherein was most of God, least of man, when vaine flourishes of wit, and words were declined, and the demonstration of Gods Spirit and power studyed: yet could hee distinguish between studied plainnesse and negligent rudenesse. He accounted perspicuity the best grace of a Preacher: And that method best, which was most helpfull to understanding, affection, and memory. To which ordinarily he esteemed none so conducive as that by doctrine, reason, and use. He esteemed those Sermons best that came closest to the conscience: yet would he have mens consciences awakened, not their persons disgrac't. Hee was a man of good spirituall appetite, and could not be contented with one meale a day. An afternoone Sermon did relish as well to him as one in the morning. He was not satisfied with prayers without preaching: which if it were wanting at home, he would seek abroad: yet would he not by absence discourage his Minister, if faithful, though another might have quicker gifts. A Lecture he esteemed, though not necessary, yet a blessing, and would redeem such an opportunity wth some pains and losse. The Lords day he esteemed a divine ordinance, and rest on it necessary, so far as it conduced to holinesse. He was very conscientious in observance of that day as the mart day of the Soule. He was very carefull to remember it, to

A3

get house, and heart in order for it: and when it came, he was studious to improve it. He redeemed the morning from superfluous sleep, and watched the whole day over his thoughts and words, not only to restrain them from wickednesse, but worldlinesse. All parts of the day were alike holy to him, and his care was continued in it in variety of holy duties: what he heard in publike, he repeated in private, to whet it upon himselfe and family. Lawfull recreations he thought this day unseasonable, and unlawfull ones much more abominable: yet he knew the liberty God gave him for needfull refreshing, which hee did neither refuse nor abuse. The Sacrament of Baptisme he received in Infancy, which he looked backe to in age to answer his ingagements, and claime his priviledges. The Lords Supper hee accounted part of his soules foode: to which he laboured to keep an appetite. Hee esteemed it an ordinance of neerest communion with Christ, and so requiring most exact preparation. His first care was in the examination of himselfe: yet as an act of office or charity he had an eye on others.

A5v.

He endeavoured to have the scandalous cast out of Communion: but he cast not out himselfe, because the scandalous were suffered by the negligence of others. He condemned that superstition and vanity of Popish mock-fasts: yet neglected not on occasion to humble his soule by right fasting. Hee abhorred the popish doctrine of *opus operatum* in the notion. And in practise rested in no performance, but what was done in spirit and trueth. Hee thought God had left a rule in his word for discipline, and that Aristocratically by Elders, not Monarchicall by Bishops, nor Democraticall by the people. Right Discipline he judged pertaining not to the being, but wel-being of a Church. Therefore hee esteemed those Churches most pure where the government is by Elders, yet unchurched not those where it was otherwayes. Perfection in Churches hee thought a thing rather to be desired, then hoped for. And so he expected not a Church state without al defects. The corruptions that were in Churches he thought his duty to bewaile, with endeavours of amendment: yet would he not separate, where hee might partake in the worship, and not in the corruption. He put not

holinesse in Churches, as in the Temple of the Jewes; but only counted them convenient like their Synagogues. He would have them kept decent, not magnificent: knowing that the Gospell requires not outward pomp. His chiefest musicke was singing of Psalms: wherein though he neglected not the melody of the voyce, yet he chiefly lookt after that of the heart. He disliked such Church-musicke as moved sensuall delight, and was an hinderance to Spirituall enlargments. He accounted subjection to the Higher powers to be part of pure religion, as well as to visite the fatherlesse and widows: yet did hee distinguish between authority, and lusts of Magistrates, to that he submitted, but in these he durst not be a servant of men, being bought with a price. Just lawes and commands he willingly obeyed not only for fear but for conscience also; But such as were unjust he refused to observe, chusing rather to obey God then man: yet his refusall was modest and with submission to penalties, unless he could procure indulgence from authority. He was carefull in all relations to know, and do duty, and that with singlenesse of heart as unto Christ. He accounted religion and engagement to duty, that the best Christians should be best husbands, best wives, best parents, best children, best Masters, best servants, best Magistrates, best subjects, that the doctrine of God might be adorned, not blasphemed. His family hee endeavoured to make a Church, both in regard of persons and exercises, admitting none into it but such as feared God; and labouring that those that were borne in it, might be born againe to God. He blessed his family morning and evening by the word and prayer; and took care to perform those ordinances in the best season. Hee brought up his children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and commanded his servants to keepe the way of the Lord. He set up discipline in his family, as he desired it in the Church, not onely reprovng but restraining vilenesse in his. He was consciencious of equity as well as piety: knowing that unrighteousnesse is abomination as well as ungodlinesse. He was cautelous in promising, but carefull in performing, counting his word no lesse engagement then his bond. He was a man of a tender heart, not only in regard of his own sin, but o-

A4v.

there miserie, not counting mercy arbitrary, but a necessary duty: wherein as he prayed for wisdome to direct him, so he studied for cheerfulness and bounty to act. He was sober in the use of the things of this life, rather beating downe the body, then pampering it: yet he denyed not himselfe the use of Gods blessing, lest he should be unthankfull, but avoided excesse lest he should be forgetfull of the Doner. In his habite he avoyded costlinesse and vanity, neither exceeding his degree in civility, nor declining what suted with Christianity, desiring in all things to expresse gravity. His whole life hee accounted a warfare, wherein Christ was his Captaine, his armes, prayers and teares. The Crosse his Banner, and his word *vincit qui patitur*² texts.

He was ἀνὴρ τετελειωμένος³ immovable in all times, so that they who in the midst of many opinions have lost the view of true religion, may return to him, and there find it.

READER, seeing a passage in Mr. Tombes his book against pædobaptisme, wherein hee compares the Nonconformists in England to the Anabaptists in Germany, in regard to their miscariages, and ill successe in their endeavours, till of late years; I was moved for the vindication of those faithfull and Reverend witnesses of Christ to publish this Character: whereof if any shall desire prooffe in matter of fact, as in matter of right the margent contains evidence: let him either consult their writings, or those who are fit witnesses vy reason of age, fidelity and acquaintance, having full known their doctrine, manner of life, purpose, faith, long-suffering, love, patience, persecution, and affliction and etc. 2 Tim. 3, 10, 11. And I doubt not but full testimony will be given, that their ayme and generall course was according to this rule: some extravagants there be in all professions, but we are to judge of a profession by the rule they hold forth, and that carriage of the professors, which is generall and ordinary.

FINIS

² Text prints *patiter*.

³ Cf. Aristotle, *Rh.* 1411b, 27, Eph. vi, 18, and I Cor. xv, 58.

AN ENGLISH CATHEDRAL LIBRARY IN THE 17th CENTURY

By **WILHELM SCHENK**

DR. DAVID MATHEW, discussing seventeenth century college libraries, speaks of their "openness to continental influence and a sense of the still unshattered republic of learning," and he adds: "A careful study of seventeenth century cathedral and chapter libraries would be rewarding."¹ Both these statements are amply borne out by a study of the Library of Exeter Cathedral. It so happens that a catalogue of this library was compiled in the early years of the eighteenth century, and this catalogue is extant. It contains more than 3,000 entries; the library may well have contained 3,000—4,000 books at that period.

As may be expected, the proportion of books printed abroad is very high. The cataloguer gives the place of printing in a large majority of cases. I have not had the patience to count them all. I have confined myself to the letters A—F, firmly believing in the law of averages. The total number of entries under these letters is 1,297; of these, 397 were printed in England, in 200 cases the place of printing is not given, and 700 were printed abroad. The number of foreign books, clearly a conservative estimate, represents 54 per cent. of the total.

It is equally instructive to turn to the titles of the books. We notice the continental editions of the Fathers and the Schoolmen: Augustin, Abelard, Ambrose, Athanasius, Aquinas, Biel, Bonaventura, Chrysostom, Gerson, Gregory of Nazianzen,

¹ D. Mathew, *Social Structure in Caroline England* (1948), pp. 82-83.

Gregory of Nyssa, Hilary, Jerome, Justin Martyr, Lombard, Origen, Scotus, Tertullian, and others. In the very beginning of Elizabeth's reign John Jewel, soon to be Bishop of Salisbury, complained that no copies of the early Fathers could be found in the Exeter Cathedral library;² by the seventeenth century the Fathers had arrived in full strength. So had the chief classical authors (with Aristotle leading far and away) and the humanists: Erasmus (the Basle edition of his Opera, 1540), Cornelius Agrippa, Budé, Isaac Casaubon, Cardano, Comenius, Ficino, Fracastoro, Linacre, Lipsius, the elder Pico, Politian, Pontano, the Scaligers, Valla, Vives. There were, of course, a great many books about the theological controversies arising out of the Reformation. The leading Protestant theologians were adequately represented (with the notable exception of Luther), but so were—and this is more surprising—the leading Catholic scholars: Baronius, Bellarmine (his Opera in five volumes and four other works), Cajetan, A Castro, Harpsfield, Mariana, Molina, More, Pighius, Pole, Sander, Stapleton, Suarez, Salmeron (an impressive and often neglected group). And there were even the Unitarian authors of the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum* as well as Faustus Socinus.

A strong emphasis on theology is bound to be a feature of a cathedral library. But in this library there were in addition many non-theological books of great interest. Among these were works by Dante, Petrarch, Rabelais, Tasso, and Cervantes. We also find many books about history and political thought: Althusius, Barclay, Botero, Bodin, Camden, Castiglione, Clarendon, Coke, Contarini, Guicciardini, Giovio, Lord Herbert, Knolles, Milton, Macchiavelli (with all his major works), Marsilius of Padua, Raleigh, Selden, Spelman, Stow, Speed, and Wood. It is perhaps even more remarkable that we find the names of daring philosophers and scientists (Montaigne, Charron, Kepler, Digby, Gassendi, Harvey, Boyle), and in particular the epoch-making names of Francis Bacon (Opera 1638), Descartes (Opera 1663), and Hobbes (first edition of *Leviathan* and Opera Philosophica 1668). A reader con-

² *Transactions of the Devonshire Association*, Vol. 31, p. 44.

sulting this library towards the end of the seventeenth century could evidently acquaint himself with both the old and the new currents of thought.

Among the books printed in England, too, there were some that indicate a surprising range of interests—surprising, that is, among professional theologians: Chaucer, Crashaw, Cowley, George Herbert, Burton, Thomas Browne, Walton, and, first and foremost, a part (the Tragedies) of Shakespeare's Second Folio of 1632 (the absence of Milton's poems, however, is worth noting). Here one would also have to mention again the English historians, antiquaries, philosophers and scientists, whose works were in the library. As far as English theology is concerned we find English representatives of medieval thought, such as Roger Bacon, Buridan, and Bradwardine (though not Ockham); some sixteenth century writers (for instance, Foxe, Jewel, and Hooker); and members of the high Anglican school such as Andrewes, Ussher, Donne, James I, and Laud. Even apart from that school it is noticeable that many of the writers selected from the vast body of available religious literature possessed an uncommon width of outlook and a positive attitude to many medieval traditions: the Cambridge Platonists—Cudworth, More, Culverwell, and Smith; latitudinarians like Hales, Chillingworth, and Taylor; and, from the Puritan camp, Perkins, Ames, and Baxter. All these writers were in varying degrees Christian humanists; they were all indebted to the greatest Christian humanist of that age, whose works were conspicuously well represented in this library: Hugo Grotius. And one of the few presentation copies included in the library is dedicated to Richard Thomson, one of the translators of the Authorized Version, by no less a Christian humanist than Isaac Casaubon.³

How did all these books get into this library? In many cases we simply do not know. It does not appear from the cathedral records that there was any fund in existence for the purchase of books; they must have been given or bequeathed to

³ This is a copy of Casaubon's *Animadversiones in Athenei Dipnosophistas*, Leyden 1600.

the library, no doubt often by members of the cathedral chapter. We happen to know the names of some very generous donors: Robert Hall, D.D., eldest son of Bishop Joseph Hall, Canon and Treasurer of Exeter Cathedral 1629-1641 (died 1667), bequeathed to the library sixty folios and forty quartos; Edward Cotton, D.D., grandson of Bishop William Cotton, Canon (1660) and Treasurer (1672) of Exeter Cathedral (died 1675), left the enormous number of 377 folios, 216 quartos, and 609 octavos; several other dignitaries left a few, possibly very valuable, books; and an unknown layman, "Hugh Potter, Esq.", left twenty pounds for the purchase of books.⁴ Neither Hall nor Cotton seem to have been in the habit of inscribing their names in the books which once belonged to them. But some former owners did have this laudable habit, and this allows us a most valuable insight into their minds.

Among the recognizable donors are several citizens of Exeter. "Mr. Benjamin Beard of this City", we read in the Benefactor's Book, gave the works of Gomarus; "Mr. Abishai Brocas of this City, Stationer" gave the works of King Charles I; and in 1669 "Mr. Edward Foxwell of this City, Mercer" gave the English works of Sir Thomas More. A copy of Patricius' *Republic* may have belonged to William Martyn, Recorder of Exeter and an historical writer of note. Thomas Isaac of Polsloe, near Exeter, himself the author of a *Methodus cognoscendi causas*, possessed Ramus' *Dialectics* (Paris 1554). A copy of *L'Alcorano di Macometto* (n.pl., 1547), complete with outraged comments on the fly-leaves, seems to have belonged to Sir Thomas Hoby, the translator of the *Cortegiano*.

The more frequently recurring names of former owners, as we might expect, belonged to clerics. Of these the earliest is Thomas Somaster, Archdeacon of Cornwall, 1571-1603 (a member of a well-known local family). He owned, among others, Bullingers' *De Persecutionibus Ecclesiae Christianae* (Zürich 1573) and *Compendium Christianae Religionis* (Zürich

⁴ This information is contained in *A Catalogue of Benefactors to this Library*, now in the custody of the Friends of Exeter Cathedral. I am indebted to Miss Stephenson for allowing me to use it.

1563); a minor work of Zwingli's; and a collection of letters that had passed between Jewel and Dr. Henry Cole (London 1560). His bias, it would seem, lay on the Protestant side, but it is hazardous to base too much on this evidence. A much clearer picture emerges from the books of a man who seems to have been a major (and hitherto unrecorded) benefactor of this library: William Huchenson, Canon of Exeter Cathedral (1608), Archdeacon of Cornwall (1603), and Rector of Kenn (1604), who died in 1616. Here is a representative group of Huchenson's books:

Theodoretus, *Commentary on the Old Testament* (in Greek, Paris 1558)

Rabanus Maurus, *Commentaria* (Cologne 1532)

Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Contra Gentiles* (Leyden 1587)

Duns Scotus, *Super Sententias* (Venice 1580)

Summa Angelica de casibus conscientiae (Strassburg 1495)

Biel, *Commentaria super Sententias* (Brescia 1574)

Flacius Illyricus, *Refutatio Invectivae Bruni Contra Centurias Historiae Ecclesiasticae* (Basle 1566)

Oecolampadius, *Annotationes in Evangelium Johannis* (Basle 1533)

Cajetan, *Evangelia cum Commentariis* (Paris 1536)

Calvin, *Institutiones* (Geneva 1568)

Pighius, *About the Colloquy of Ratisbon* (Paris 1542)

Cheminicius, *Examen Concilii Tridentini* (Frankfort 1578)

John Foxe, *Meditationes in Sacram Apocalypsin* (London, 1587; this book was sent to Huchenson by the publisher, at the author's request)

Molina, *Commentaria in Primam Divi Thomae [i.e. Aquinatis] Partem* (n.pl., 1592)

Aquinas, Scotus, Cajetan, Calvin, Foxe, Molina: certainly a wide choice!

Huchenson, in one of his books, describes himself as

"*Londinensis*" and in another as of "*Aulae Pembro. Cantab.*". His entry in *Alumni Cantabrigienses* is rather confused and so are various other references to him. There were perhaps three William Huchensons with similar careers; two of them were Canons of Exeter and Rectors of Kenn (they may well have been father and son).⁵ It was, at any rate, the elder of these who possessed the books, as is evident from the dates occasionally added to his signature. This man was a Londoner, had been to Cambridge, and then held various dignities in the diocese of Exeter. The quiet little church of Kenn is the fitting background to this studious man, who, in the age of Hooker and Andrewes, was setting a worthy example of Christian scholarship.

Another learned country parson whose books reached the cathedral library was William Miller, Vicar of Christow in Devonshire, 1622-1671. He was a Devon man, born in 1593, who had gone to Broadgates Hall, Oxford, and taken his B.A. in 1620, and his M.A. in 1623. Of Miller's books two deserve special mention: Alstedius, *Methodus Sacrosanctae Theologiae* (8 volumes, Frankfort 1614), and a copy of Thomas More's Latin Works (Louvain 1565) bound together with the Latin writings of John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester (Würzburg 1597). Into his copy of Alstedius, Miller wrote a beautiful prayer for a student "used by him dayly (Anno 1620)": "O God, the father of our lord Jesus Christ who art most glorious in majesty and most garcious in thy mercyes, under whose power and providence the safetye of man kynd and all things doth consist . . . [grant] that as I shall grow in yeeres I may encrease more and more in knowledge and wisdom and specially in the knowledge of thy word and the mistery of godlines therein revealed to the salvation of myne owne soule, the edification of my brethren, the profit both of church and comon weale, and the glory of thy blessed name through Jesus our Saviour".

In 1709 the library received two very large bequests: from Humphrey Smith, Vicar of Dartmouth and Prebendary of

⁵ The memorial tablet in Kenn Church seems to be intended for the younger of these.

Exeter since 1705, and from Robert Burscough, Vicar of Totnes, Archdeacon of Barnstaple, and Prebendary of Exeter since 1709.⁶ Smith arranged in his last will (proved April 6, 1709) for his "dear friend" Burscough to choose any books he liked and for the rest to go to the cathedral library in Exeter, provided copies of them were not there already. Within a few months Burscough was dead too (he died July 27, 1709); he left all his books to this library. In this way, 531 books belonging to Smith came into the library; the number of Burscough's books cannot now be ascertained but may well have been equally large. These books are not listed in the manuscript catalogue mentioned above; it is indeed likely that these bequests provided the stimulus for producing a complete catalogue in order to ascertain which books the library was entitled to receive.

Smith's library was very remarkable. Its keynotes were the same as those of the cathedral collection: width of interest and outlook, Christian humanism. The following were among the books that came to the cathedral library under his bequest:

Andrewes, *Sermons* (London 1661).

Aquinas, *Enarrationes in Evangelia* (Venice 1584).

Arminius, *Opera* (Frankfort 1631).

Aristophanes, *Comoediae* (Amsterdam 1670).

Ascham, *Epistolae* (Hanover 1610).

Bellarmino, *Disputationes* (Cologne 1628).

Thomas Browne, *Works* (London 1707).

Boyle, *Experimenta Physicomechanica* (Oxford 1662).

Boyle, *Of Colours* (n.pl., n.d.).

Botero, *Relationes Universales* (Spanish, n.pl., 1603).

Chrysostom, *Opera* (8 vols., n.pl., probably the famous Eton edition).

Camden, *Britannia* (London 1594).

⁶ Copies of the wills of Smith and Burscough, as well as a list of Smith's books, are among the Dean and Chapter MSS. No. 4733. There is an account of Burscough in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

- Calvin, *On the Epistles of St. Paul* (Geneva 1580).
 Isaac Casaubon, *Exercitationes in Annales Baronii* (Geneva 1655).
 Meric Casaubon, *Of Enthusiasm* (London 1656).
 Descartes, *De Homine* (Amsterdam 1659).
 Descartes, *De Geometria* (Leyden 1664).
 Descartes, *Of the Passions* (French, n.pl., 1652).
 Dryden, *Various Works* (London 1659, 1682, 1685, etc.).
 Euripides (Cambridge 1694).
 Erasmus, *Adagia* (Amsterdam 1650).
 Erasmus, *Colloquia* (Amsterdam 1650).
 Filmer, *Patriarcha* (London 1680).
 Galileo, *Systema Cosmicum* (London 1663).
 Grotius, *Epistolae* (Amsterdam 1687).
 Grotius, *De Veritate Christianae Religionis* (Oxford 1700).
 Homer, *Iliad* (Cambridge 1664).
 Harvey, *Exercitationes Anatomicae* (Rotterdam 1661).
 Irenaeus, *Opera* (Oxford 1702).
 Isocrates, *Orationes* (n.pl., n.d.).
 Lipsius, *Tractatus* (Antwerp 1625).
 Lucan, *Pharsalia* (Amsterdam 1643).
 Marcus Aurelius, *De Seipso* (Oxford 1680).
 Oecolampadius, *On Isaiah* (Basle 1525).
 Philo (Greek and Latin, Paris 1640).
 Polybius, *History* (Amsterdam 1670).
 Ray, *Wisdom of God in the Works of the Creation* (n.pl., n.d.).
 Ray, *Four Other Works*.
 Richelieu, *Political Will* (London 1695).
The Case of Ship Money, with Other Pamphlets (n.pl., 1640).
 Stillingfleet, *Unreasonableness of Separation* (London 1681).
 Scaliger, *Opuscula varia* (n.pl.).
 Seneca, *Tragoediae* (London 1650).
 Sanderson, *Sermons* (London 1671).
 Terentius, *Comoediae* (London 1688).

Thucydides, (Oxford 1696).

Winstanley, *Lives of the English Poets* (n.pl., n.d.).

Wallis, *Defence of the Royal Society* (n.pl., n.d.).

Wasmuth, *Gramatica Arabica* (Amsterdam 1654).

In Burscough's case we cannot rely on a full list of his books, but we can identify some of them from his signature or initials. He possessed, of course, quite a number of works on controversial theology, current in the seventeenth century and now happily forgotten; Burscough himself was the author of some tracts against dissenters. But many of his books belonged to the tradition so well represented in this library: Bellarmine and his critics, Baxter, Grotius, Joseph Hall, Limborch, Mabillon, and others. Four of his books must be singled out for special mention: Cusanus, *Opera* (Basle 1565); *Conciliator* (Frankfort 1633), by Menasseh ben Israel, the teacher of Spinoza; more important still, a first edition of Spinoza's posthumous works (n.pl., 1677); and finally a book by Henry More with an inscription *ex dono authoris*, suggesting personal acquaintance with the great Cambridge Platonist.

Here we must end. By the time Burscough's and Smith's books had arrived in Exeter the cathedral library, mainly a product of the seventeenth century, may well have contained nearly five thousand works, a selection of the best thought of the ages. The library survives as a monument to a wide and coherent view of God and man. Nowadays the books are seldom reached down from their shelves. But the men who were mainly responsible for the growth of this library were trying to achieve a significant task the very existence of which is now almost forgotten—the task of guarding the European heritage of wisdom and contemplation. Christian humanism: nothing less than that was, and is, at stake. No doubt these men were not always equal to their task; perhaps they were not comprehending and comprehensive enough, perhaps they were too often “resting on their oars”. But in the midst of turmoil and strife they tried, according to their lights, to preserve their central traditions. And they did so in a spirit that was averse to the “brawls which were grown from religion”—an Erasmian

spirit echoed in a sentence which William Miller wrote into one of his books: *Praestat dubitare de occultis quam litigare de incertis*. In the end these men were defeated, not by force, but by a certain kind of obscurantism that passed for "enlightenment". But that is another story.⁷

⁷ I should like to express my sincere gratitude for the generous and patient help I have received from Miss M. P. Crighton, Honorary Librarian of the Exeter Cathedral Library, and Miss M. S. G. Hands, who is producing a catalogue of all cathedral libraries in England and Wales. Most of the books mentioned in this article are still in the Exeter Cathedral Library; the losses throughout the centuries have fortunately been very light.

GIRALDUS CAMBRENSIS AND THE PRIMACY OF CANTERBURY

By I. P. SHAW

At St. Albans, in September 1202, Giraldus Cambrensis presented an interesting document to the Bishops of Ely and Worcester. It embodied Gerald's suggestions for a compromise about the great controversy concerning the metropolitan claims of the church of St. Davids, of which he, a canon of the cathedral and Archdeacon of Brecknock was the protagonist, and the two bishops the judges delegated by Innocent III to hear the case.

Gerald proposed either that St. Davids should be recognized forthwith as a metropolitan see, but subject to Canterbury; or else that the testimony of his witnesses should be kept under seal at Rome, Canterbury and St. Davids, so that during the life of Hubert Walter the contention might be suspended. As an earnest of his good faith Gerald would resign his election into the Pope's hands. But, he added, if neither Pope nor archbishop should approve this plan, there was no alternative save to let the whole matter run its legal course.¹

There is evidence that Hubert Walter gave the proposal some attention. He did not turn it down at once, but replied evasively through the Bishop of Worcester that he must consult all his suffragans and sound the Pope. And we may assume that it was the first of Gerald's points that led to his temporizing reply, for the latter had written skilfully as well as tactfully and

¹ *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera*, ed. J. S. Brewer, Dimock and Warner (Rolls Series) III. 53-55, and 229-231.

with a rare restraint.² One metropolitan church, he pointed out, was wont to be subject to another *jure primatiae*—as was Bordeaux to Bourges—and, he added, a church is not properly a primacy unless it has an archbishop subject to itself.³

The point was important as well as adroit. Among the parties concerned in the St. Davids question the Archbishops of Canterbury had proved themselves for more than sixty years the most resolute opponents of Welsh ecclesiastical independence.⁴ Crown and Curia alike took heed of their wishes, if no more, and though Gerald might expect justice, and find sympathy, at Rome, he could hope for neither at Westminster. This he knew, and his proposal in 1202 reveals a clever attempt to win over his most important adversary. Hubert Walter was both tenacious of his rights and conscious of his position. Elected on May 29 by the chapter of Canterbury, and on the next day by the bishops of the southern province, he had received the pallium and been enthroned in November, 1193. Less than two years later Celestine III made him legate for all England, but nothing had been said as to his primacy. Celestine's letter of appointment⁵ specifically overrode the privileges of the northern archbishop, but Hubert Walter had himself once been Dean of York, and knew only too well the claims of that province to independence.⁶ With Geoffrey Plantagenet at York he had a difficult neighbour. Giraldus' suggestion was subtle: there was such a thing as "Dorobernian pride."

² His letter expressed the hope that the archbishop would long be spared to the honour of the Church. Both earlier and later his animadversions on Hubert Walter were of a very different nature—cf. his *de Invectionibus* I, 10. (Op. III, 37-39.)

³ *Primatiae namque proprie sedes, ut nostis, non est nisi quae subditum sibi archiepiscopum habet.* (Op. III, 54.)

⁴ See J. E. Lloyd's judgement (*History of Wales*, II, 485.) "It was an easier matter to shake off the yoke of the English crown than to escape from the control of the English primate."

⁵ Ralph of Diceto (R.S.) II, 125-127.

⁶ For his behaviour as dean and his subsequent hostility to Geoffrey, see Roger of Hoveden (R.S.) IV, Introduction, p. xli, *et seq.*

Throughout the twelfth century the status of the Archbishop of Canterbury as Primate of all England had not gone unchallenged. St. Davids with its claim to metropolitan rank was no side issue, but a source of serious and long-lasting irritation to those men enthroned at Canterbury whose position had provoked envy at Winchester, enmity at London and sleepless vigilance at York. In the case of St. Davids it is plain that issues wider than the purely ecclesiastical were involved. English aggression both royal and baronial, the national revival under Owen Gwynedd, Henry II's Irish policy and his virtual alliance with the Lord Rhys after 1166, in addition to the cross-currents of personal ambition and party vendetta, all these factors complicated a situation which the vigorous intransigence of Giraldus did much to perpetuate and perhaps to obscure in his insistence on the claims of "Mynyw . . . the sole lantern of my country."⁷

In Wales the influence of the English Church had preceded the power of the English crown. About 768 Elfod of Bangor had induced the Welsh to adopt the Roman date of Easter, but the decision had intensified rather than lessened the hostility between his countrymen and the English,⁸ and it was not until 963 that an Archbishop of Canterbury, Dunstan, first consecrated a Welsh bishop to his see, Gucan of Llandaff.⁹ But from that time, with a single exception, Canterbury maintained its power over Llandaff, and in 1107 with the consecration of Urban to the bishopric the regular series of professions of canonical obedience begins.¹⁰

⁷ Op. I, 301.

⁸ *Handbook of British Chronology*, 195. Also Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland*, I, 204. Elfod died in 809 as "Archbishop of Gwynedd", but both his policy and position were disputed by the Bishops of Llandaff and Menevia, "being themselves archbishops of older privilege."

⁹ Stubbs' *Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum* (2nd ed.), 29.

¹⁰ The exception was in the case of Herewald, bishop 1056-1104, consecrated by Cynesige of York. (Stigand holding Canterbury.) R.S.A., 36. In Urban's profession of obedience he refers to Anselm as *totius Britanniae primas*.

Two other Welsh sees, Bangor and St. Asaph, were brought under the supremacy of Canterbury more slowly and with greater difficulty.¹¹ In 1092 Hervey, a Breton, was consecrated to Bangor by Thomas of York in the absence of a metropolitan at Canterbury. A favourite of William Rufus, later the confessor of Henry I, and plainly a man of considerable resource and ability, he was to cause some trouble in the Church. An unsuccessful attempt to translate him to Lisieux in 1107, was followed by his violent expulsion from Wales in the next year, and in 1109 he became the first bishop of the newly-created see of Ely.¹² It seems that his severity in Wales had aroused intense opposition and not until 1120, six years after Henry I's victory over Gruffydd, was another bishop appointed. A Welshman, David, *electus a principe Griffino, clero et populo Walliae*, he made a profession of obedience to Canterbury where his consecration took place.¹³ In 1140 his successor, Maurice, another Welshman, consecrated by Theobald, promised obedience to the archbishop, and after some show of resistance swore fealty to the English King.¹⁴ But he does not seem to have been his own master at Bangor where the archdeacon, Simeon, exercised

¹¹ For the possible existence of seven bishoprics in Wales at various times prior to the 12th century, see H. & S., I, 143-150. Only one of them, Llanelwy, was to be revived under its better known name of St. Asaph in 1143. See below, p. 87.

¹² R.S.A., 40. This attempted translation is of great interest as showing Anselm's views on the question. Writing to Henry I, he says, "... qui sacratus est Episcopus non potest constitui in alia provincia Episcopus canonice sine consilio et assensu Archiepiscopi et Episcoporum ejusdem provinciae cum auctoritate Apostolica, nec sine absolutione Archiepiscopi et Episcoporum provinciae in qua sacratus est." (H. & S., I, 304.) Later, in 1163, when Foliot was translated from Hereford to London, Hervey's translation to Ely was quoted as a precedent.

¹³ R.S.A., 43. Urban of Llandaff was among those who assisted Archbishop Ralph.

¹⁴ R.S.A., 45. According to Giraldus, (Op. III, 59) Owen Gwynedd and his brother appealed to Bishop Bernard of St. Davids against the intrusion of Maurice.

great influence,¹⁵ and on Maurice's death in 1161 the see remained vacant until 1177 in spite of the intervention of Becket and of Alexander III.

Becket's ineffectiveness is noteworthy. In 1163, at the assembly at Woodstock, Owen Gwynedd and the Lord Rhys performed homage to Henry II. A year later both revolted, and the same Council of Northampton in October, 1164, which saw Henry's military preparations for vengeance, also saw the flight of the archbishop. Not unnaturally Owen sought to profit from the estrangement of his adversaries, and wrote at first to Becket saying, *vestri exsilii damnosam sentimus absentiam*. But he also asked Becket to approve the ordination of his bishop "elsewhere", promising, however, that as a matter of grace, obedience should be professed to Canterbury.¹⁶ Becket, in exile more fiercely insistent than ever on the privileges of his office, refused.¹⁷ But for the remainder of his life he could obtain no satisfaction from Owen, who apparently suppressed papal letters, detained the archbishop's messenger, and kept his wife whom the Pope had ordered him to put away. More important, he approved the "hateful action" of the archdeacon and canons of Bangor, who seem to have secured for themselves a bishop consecrated in Ireland.¹⁸ Owen's independence of course, in the ecclesiastical sphere, resulted from his military success in 1164, when Henry II's great invasion ended in rain and disaster on the Berwyn hills. For different reasons Alexander III, Becket, and Henry Plantagenet had all good cause to hate Owen, but the advantages he gained from their mutual dissensions

¹⁵ For this interesting person, who died in 1151/2, see Lloyd, *op. cit.* II, 469, n. 25, and 483, n. 93.

¹⁶ H. & S., I, 364.

¹⁷ Becket was consecrated on June 3, 1162, as archbishop. He was created legate on April 24, 1166, (though without authority over York.) In the same year, or in 1167, he received a separate conferment of the primacy from Alexander III. See F. Makower, *Constitutional History of the Church of England*, 286, n. 15, and authorities there quoted.

¹⁸ H. & S., I, 369. *Tam detestibile factum, tam nefandum facinus*, Becket called it.

were insufficiently great to bring those quarrels to an end. He died, excommunicate, in November 1170, and was buried in the cathedral whose inviolability he had maintained. Not until 1177, the year of David's homage to Henry II at Geddington, did Bangor receive a Canterbury nominee,¹⁹ and more than two centuries later Owen Glendower remembered and repeated his predecessor's bid for the independence of the north Welsh sees.²⁰

For Bangor was not the only bishopric which Owen had kept from Canterbury. Writing of the year 1124/5, Hugh the Chantor mentions a proposal whereby to end the quarrel between York and Canterbury, the latter province should cede three bishoprics to the former—Chester (i.e., Coventry and Lichfield), Bangor, and *tercium inter hos duos medium sed pro vastitate et barbarie Episcopo vacantem*.²¹ This third was Llan-elwy or St. Asaph, which had been held by Owen since the revolt of 1135. In 1143 Theobald consecrated a certain Gilbert at Canterbury as bishop to the see, but neither he nor his successors, the celebrated Geoffrey of Monmouth (1152-54), Richard (1154-55), or Godfrey (1160-75) obtained possession of the see for long.²² The last named, indeed, was driven from St. Asaph in 1164, and appears to have incurred the anger of Becket who ordered him to return or resign. But this may have been due to the use which Henry II made of him as administrator of Abingdon Abbey (1165-1175). He took part in the coronation of the young King in 1170, and Becket suspended him as a consequence. In 1175 he resigned his bishopric and gave back

¹⁹ R.S.A., 49. The new bishop, Guy, may possibly have been the former Dean of Waltham Holy Cross, where Henry II replaced secular canons by regular ones in the same year.

²⁰ H. & S., I, 668-670.

²¹ *Historians of the Church of York*, (R.S.) II, 211.

²² R.S.A., 46, 47, 48. Gilbert did not make a profession of obedience to Canterbury; the others did. If we are to believe Giraldus this same Gilbert was meant to have been consecrated by Bishop Bernard of St. Davids as metropolitan (Op. III, 56-58.) Unfortunately his is the only evidence for the alleged letter of the Chapter of St. Davids to Eugenius III on this matter.

his staff and ring to Archbishop Richard who then consecrated Adam of Petit-Pont to the see.²³

As far as North Wales was concerned, the authority of Canterbury had thus emerged successfully, though not unchallenged, from the great period of revolt. Undoubtedly the absence of any national metropolitan made this success inevitable, and though, on one occasion, Owen seems to have resorted to an Irish consecration, the instance is unique. Without their own archbishop the Welsh found themselves ecclesiastically at an enormous disadvantage; not only had they to resort to the detested English superiority for consecrations, but without an acknowledged head of the Welsh Church there was no focus around which the reawakened sense of nationality could rally.

It is in the light of an effort to provide for this desideratum that the attempt to raise the bishopric of St. Davids to metropolitan rank takes on its real interest and significance. From the Welsh standpoint the tragedy was that St. Davids "invested with the pallium of Caerleon"²⁴ lay with its phantom claims in a tiny valley by the sea at the utmost edge of Pembroke, far removed from the centre of political independence in the North. And like all the Welsh sees, it was miserably poor.²⁵ But despite poverty and situation, once joined, the issue with Canterbury was maintained with a tenacity and resourcefulness equalled only by the complementary struggle for national survival.

²³ *Gesta Regis Henrici II* (R.S.) I, 90.

²⁴ *Menevia pallio urbis Legionum induetur*. A famous phrase attributed by Geoffrey of Monmouth to Merlin, and made much of by Giraldus (Op. III, 169-176.) On the metropolitical claims of Caerleon see H. & S., I, 149, and R.S.A., Appendix VII. The answer of Dinoh to St. Augustine in 602, which mentions Caerleon, is said to be a twelfth-century forgery—in which case the date of its composition is significant. (See Wilkins, *Concilia* I, 26-27, for a Latin and English translation.)

²⁵ Compare Henry of Huntingdon's remark, *Historia Anglorum* (R.S.) 10, on the Bishops of St. Davids, Bangor and Glamorgan (Llandaff), *nullarum urbium Episcopi propter desolationem Walliae*.

Contemporaries were not unaware of the connexion between political and ecclesiastical independence. The primacy of Canterbury itself, first asserted by Lanfranc, was a concomitant of William I's conception of his English kingship, and William of Newburgh, writing at the end of the twelfth century, makes an interesting comment on the situation. The barbarous peoples of Europe, he says, on their conversion to Christianity were content with bishops, but as they advanced in civilization, these "Hibernienses, Norici, Daci, Gothi" had begun to have archbishops in his day—a remark which shows how well William was informed.²⁶ But the Welsh, because of their political weakness vis-à-vis the English were denied a metropolitan. Hence their determination to prove to the world that they were thereby denied their just rights. It is true, as has been remarked, that the claims advanced by the advocates of St. Davids sought not so much authority over the Welsh as freedom from the English Church. It has not, perhaps, been sufficiently appreciated that such freedom in the twelfth century was an essential factor, if not a preliminary hall-mark of nationhood. And in its reserve of power to confer or to withhold archiepiscopal status lay one of the strongest sanctions of Rome.

The story of the fight for the independence of St. Davids has been told more than once,²⁷ but by no one with such vigour, so fully, and with such frankly partisan prejudice as by Giraldus himself. There are four main episodes: the claims advanced by the chapter of St. Davids under Bishop Bernard (1115-1148) including Bernard's own pleading before Eugenius III at Meaux in 1147; the renewed claims of the chapter at the Council of Westminster in March, 1176; the repetition of these arguments before Alexander III at the Lateran Council of March, 1179;

²⁶ William of Newburgh's *Historia Rerum Anglicarum* in *Chronicles of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I* (R.S.) I, 16. Archbishops had been set up in Ireland in 1152, in Norway in 1154, in Sweden in 1164.

²⁷ Lloyd, *op. cit.* II, 480-486, and 623, with authorities there quoted.

and the great fight put up by Gerald himself between 1198 and 1203, ending in his discomfiture, resignation and retirement, but with the question of metropolitan status still undetermined. Eighty-one years later Thomas Bek of St. Davids made a last, fruitless protest against Pecham's archiepiscopal visitation.²⁸ The tradition of independence died hard.

Undoubtedly much of the celebrity attaching to the case of St. Davids is due to Giraldus. Almost contemporaneously a similar dispute took place at Bangor (1197-1203), where the Canterbury candidate, Robert, was met with opposition and appeals to Rome, but lacking a great literary advocate, the affair is less well-known. Nor can it be denied that these very literary gifts of Gerald throw doubt on his historical veracity.²⁹ As he himself admitted in his "Retractations" all his statements about anything connected with St. Davids prior to the death of Bishop Wilfrid (1085-1115), were based on hearsay rather than certainty.³⁰

Giraldus, indeed, cannot be altogether blamed on this count. The uncertainty as to the existence of any metropolitan in Wales prior to 1115 when the last Welsh Bishop of St. Davids died, is heightened by the loose employment of the title in Welsh records. According to the *Brut y tywysogion*, Bangor, Llandaff and St. Davids had all boasted archbishops, and even as late as 1152 a notice on the death of Geoffrey of Monmouth describes

²⁸ H. & S., I, 528, 571, 576-579. Thomas's reasons are interesting: he was prepared to admit Pecham's right of visitation *ut primatem suum, non ut Archiepiscopum*, and asserted, so Pecham wrote to the monks of Christ Church, that *inter Menevensem et Cantuariensem Ecclesias in Romana curia lis pendebat, et adhuc pendet indecisa*.

²⁹ One of the most delightful examples of his verve is his account of how at Rome in April, 1203, he pleaded for the rights of St. Davids in Consistory "and a murmur of approval followed from the multitude as the whole Court gave Giraldus their applause, if not with their voice, at least in their desires." Op. III, 270. (Translation in H. E. Butler, *The Autobiography of Giraldus Cambrensis*, p. 300.)

³⁰ Op. I, 426. In this same short work he does much to rehabilitate the character of Hubert Walter.

him as the foster-son of Uchtryd "Archbishop" of Llandaff, who had died in 1148.³¹

What is certain, however, is that, prior to the twelfth century no Bishop in Wales had presided as archbishop over a province with provincial courts and officials, or with rights of visitation over diocesans canonically subject to himself. No papal legate had ever been sent to Wales since the days of St. Augustine and, though bishops had undoubtedly consecrated one another, this had neither implied nor conferred archiepiscopal status among the seven semi-historical Welsh sees. An egregious imagination can alone account for the 118 bishops at the synod of Llandewi-Brefi (c. 570) under St. David, or the "sevenscore croziers" who are said to have assembled to pass the Laws of Howel Dda in 928.

Again, as Giraldus found to his cost, there was no evidence whatever that any Pope had ever sent a pallium to the occupant of a Welsh see. In Western Europe it had become customary in the ninth century, and obligatory in the eleventh, for an archbishop to receive this symbol of his authority from the Pope, preferably at Rome. But the Welsh Church had retired into its isolation in the fifth century when such ideas were unknown, and when the term metropolitan merely denoted the bishop of the chief city in the Roman imperial province. Within this meaning there may well have been a metropolitan at Caerleon, and quite probably the standing and sanctity of St. David led to the title "archbishop" being applied to him and conceivably to his successors. But the Popes never recognized a Welsh archbishopric any more than before the twelfth century they recognized one in Ireland. Plainly in Welsh tradition, as in Welsh records, the term archbishop was employed as a mark of distinction or as a title of respect, not in its legal connotation.

But Gerald was a scholar, well aware of the contemporary interest in history, and fully alive to its advantages. He knew the works of Geoffrey of Monmouth no less than those of Bede, and whilst at Rome on his second journey in 1201, presented

³¹ H. & S., I, 360.

a lengthy memorial to Innocent III on the ecclesiastical history of the British Isles, containing along with much that was true even more that was dubious.³² His main contention centred round the person of Samson of Dol, whom he, and the chapter of St. Davids before him,³³ maintained had fled from St. Davids to Brittany bearing his pall with him. Innocent who had recently terminated a century's litigation by depriving Dol of its pallium, was in no mood to transfer the white scarf to St. Davids (despite Gerald's politic suggestion), and would seem to have known as much about St. Samson as anyone. He appears, moreover, to have placed little credence in the archdeacon's historical survey, remarking that even if the Samson story were true, the Archbishops of Canterbury were safe by long prescription.

But Gerald was not defeated. Turning from generalities to documentary evidence, he obtained permission to consult the registers of Eugenius III where to his joy he found some evidence of Bishop Bernard's undecided suit of 1147/8. He also saw, alone one evening with the Pope, a Roman provincial, or list of bishoprics, where his keen Menevian eye detected that the Welsh sees, though listed under Canterbury, were yet separated by the rubric *De Wallia*, and were entered differently from the other suffragans of the archbishop.³⁴ Innocent was

³² The address is given in Op. III, 169-176. Among other things Giraldus asserted that St. Andrews had been a metropolitan see at the time of the Roman occupation of Britain. This was perhaps a not altogether ingenuous remark: he was quite aware of the claims of the Scottish episcopate in his own day.

³³ Giraldus himself is the only authority for the statement that the chapter had made this point. On St. Samson of Dol, see the late Professor Burkitt's learned article in *Journal of Theological Studies*, XXVII, 42-57. Dol, like St. Davids a see with Celtic traditions, had maintained an intermittent independence of Tours from 845 to 1198, and was to cause further trouble.

³⁴ The late Dr. R. L. Poole (*The Papal Chancery*, p. 196) was of the opinion that Gerald may have seen the provincial of Cardinal Boso (ob. 1178), probably himself an Englishman, and legate and chamberlain to Adrian IV. Gerald's own account is given in Op. III, 165. See also *Le Liber Censuum de l'Eglise Romaine* (ed. Fabre et Duchesne.) Introd., p. 56, and text p. 226.

sufficiently impressed by these discoveries to appoint a commission to inquire into the status of St. Davids, granting Giraldus at the same time the administration of the vacant see. The latter hastened back to Wales, and prosecuting his researches, discovered among the muniments of St. Davids various worn and aged documents relating to the case. These concerned the suit mentioned above, which Bernard had begun, but they are a sad commentary both on the carelessness and lack of interest of the chapter which preserved its records so ill. The incident furnishes yet another proof of the indifference of the canons as to the greatness which Gerald's energy would have thrust upon them. Bernard himself had suppressed the ancient "Glas" at St. Davids and substituted a secular chapter,³⁵ but more than once their dissensions, disunity, disloyalty and deceit were the despair of Giraldus, who described them aptly enough as a "gang rather than a college."³⁶

Bishop Bernard of St. Davids had been all his life primarily a courtier. His reasons for opening the question of the metropolitan standing of his see reflect self-interest rather than self-sacrifice. Before 1115 one of the chaplains of Henry I's queen, his consecration in September of that year was accompanied by a profession of obedience to Archbishop Ralph, the first to be made by an occupant of that see—"by which the Bishop of St. Davids lost his privilege, which was taken by the Bishop of Canterbury."³⁷ For twenty years, until the death of Henry I and the simultaneous rising in Wales, he followed the life of a court bishop, attending synods and councils at Rheims and Rome, assisting at the consecrations of various Welsh bishops, but also finding some time for work in his diocese. During this same period he held one appointment which gave him valuable experience for his future bid for independence, the significance of which has not generally been realized. According to Hugh the Chantor, in 1123 Bernard was at Rome as the prolocutor

³⁵ H. & S., I, 308. There was no dean until 1840.

³⁶ Translation by Butler, *op. cit.*, 345. Gerald's word is *consortium*. (Op. III, 322.)

³⁷ H. & S., I, 307, quoting the *Brut*.

and pro-orator of William of Corbeuil, gone there to defend before Calixtus II the primacy of Canterbury against York.³⁸

In this capacity Bernard must have learnt much of the weakness of the famous Canterbury privileges.³⁹ He must have known at first hand the arguments used by Thurstan of York, and the indecisive outcome of the case. Perhaps more useful for his own later conduct, he witnessed the attempt made by the Scottish bishops to free themselves from dependence on York, and to acquire a pallium and an archbishop for St. Andrews. Thurstan, it is true, frustrated them, but on the grounds that the King of Scotland was the man of Henry I.⁴⁰

On the death of Henry, Bernard put forward his own claim, and Henry of Huntingdon, though on what evidence is uncertain, wrote that he actually received a pallium from the Pope—only to send it back at once—a highly improbable account.⁴¹ Ten years later both the bishop and the chapter renewed the controversy, soliciting the help of Owen Gwynedd. But Bernard's personal pleading before Eugenius III availed him little. The testimony of Robert, Bishop of Bath,⁴² that Bernard had made a written profession of obedience to Canterbury in 1115, led the Pope to give judgement against him personally,⁴³ but to appoint October 18, 1148, for the decision as to the metropolitan standing of his church. Before that date Bernard had

³⁸ *Historians of the Church of York* (R.S.), II, 201 *et seq.*

³⁹ See A. J. Macdonald, *Eadmer and the Canterbury Privileges* in *Journal of Theological Studies*, XXXII, 39-55.

⁴⁰ *Historians of the Church of York*, II, 214-215. *Volebant (episcopi Scotiae) enim requiere pallium episcopo S. Andreae et sic archiepiscopum creari. Sed archiepiscopus noster et secreto et palam in curia ostendit Scotiam de regno Angliae esse, et regem Scottorum de Scotia hominem esse regis Angliae.*

⁴¹ Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum* (R.S.), p. 10.

⁴² H. & S., I, 353. An important letter, and one not found in the works of Giraldus.

⁴³ H. & S., I, 354. A letter to Theobald of Canterbury announcing his decision. (The letter should be dated 1147, not 1148; see Lloyd, *op. cit.*, II, 481, n. 85.)

died, and his successor, David, Gerald's uncle, made an unusually full profession of obedience to Canterbury.⁴⁴

It was some of these documents concerning the processes of the thirties and forties that Giraldus discovered some fifty to sixty years later at St. Davids, but we have only his word for the protests raised by the chapter in 1176 at Westminster and in 1179 at Rome. On the first occasion, as on the second, their bishops took no action, and the only result of the demands was apparently to enable Gerald to prove to the Pope at the end of the century that the question had never been allowed to slumber.

As in the North, the ecclesiastical history of South Wales reflected the political situation. In 1063, as Gerald reminded Hubert Walter in a characteristically diffuse letter,⁴⁵ Harold had ravaged Wales, and in 1081 William I went on a "pilgrimage" as far as St. Davids to consolidate the Norman raid of two years previously. But as Florence of Worcester acutely remarked, it was the death of Rhys ap Tewdwr in 1093 and the institution of the marcher earls that marked the end of South Welsh independence. *Regnare in Walonia reges desiere*, he observed, and though a century later the Lord Rhys occupied a position of remarkable pre-eminence, this was due to the alliance between him and Henry II. Rhys's attitude throughout the St. Davids struggle is significant, for even in his early years of revolt he appears to have done nothing whatever to further the claims of the see.

Rhys, as a great historian of Wales has written, was helped by two factors: Henry II's quarrel with Becket and the King's jealousy of the Norman-Welsh magnates who undertook the conquest of Ireland. These considerations led Henry to reverse his former policy and to exalt Rhys at the expense of the

⁴⁴ H. & S., I, 355-56, which quote Gerald's specific statement (Op. III, 431) that David promised not to raise the question of the dignity of his church during his lifetime; and the actual profession which does not mention the metropolitan issue in so many words.

⁴⁵ Op., I, 96-101.

Pembroke magnates.⁴⁶ Rhys was loyal to the compact made in 1172 and as "Justice" of South Wales supported Henry during the crisis of his reign in 1173-74. In 1175 at the Council of Gloucester he was high in the royal favour, and kept the truce, or treaty, made at Geddington two years later, until his death in 1197. This alliance, for it was no less, with his Angevin overlord, meant that Rhys gave neither sympathy nor support to the chapter of St. Davids in 1176 or 1179, and helps to explain at the same time Henry's opposition to Giraldus in 1176. In that year Gerald had been elected Bishop of St. Davids (though he renounced the election early next morning), to the anger of the King, who had not been consulted. Despite the support of Archbishop Richard,⁴⁷ Henry had his way, silencing the Primate with a few savage remarks: and all this, so Roger of Worcester later told Giraldus, because he was so closely related to Rhys.⁴⁸ We may suspect this reason at this time; it was more likely that Henry had no mind to promote to St. Davids a man who was even more closely related to the Pembroke barons whose energy and ambition he had good reason to distrust.

Similarly in 1188 Rhys raised no objection to the perambulation of Wales by Archbishop Baldwin, preaching the crusade. This is perhaps not remarkable, but it is surprising that Giraldus, who accompanied Baldwin, made no complaint when the archbishop celebrated Mass in every one of the four Welsh cathedrals. Baldwin, it is true, was legate, his cause unimpeachable, and the occasion was one from which Gerald derived no small personal credit:⁴⁹ but in view of the arch-

⁴⁶ Lloyd, *op. cit.*, II, 537 *et seq.*

⁴⁷ Op. III, 123. Gerald's judgement on him is celebrated: he lost for the Church *per ignaviam* the liberty which the martyrdom of Becket had won. His views on Baldwin, Hubert Walter and Langton in the same passage are equally worth reading.

⁴⁸ Op. I, 43.

⁴⁹ Op. I, 75-76. This gives his own unblushing account of his enormous success as a preacher in Latin and French to an audience which could not understand a word of either tongue.

deacon's later behaviour he cannot escape the charge of inconsistency if no worse.

This charge of inconsistency may be extenuated when it is recalled that the *Invectiones* and *De rebus a se gestis* and the *Dialogus de iure et statu Menevensis ecclesiae* were all written after 1204, in retirement, when Giraldus had fought his fight, and could hope for little save the sympathy or indulgence of Stephen Langton. But he was determined that Langton, along with all posterity, should never plead ignorance through lack of evidence.

According to his own story, Giraldus made his great resolve to vindicate the metropolitan dignity of St. Davids after his unanimous election on June 29, 1199. The decision was momentous. He realized clearly that a conflict would ensue, involving issues and interests far wider than those of a Welsh bishopric. His words are instructive: "He would devote himself wholly and unquestioningly and without delay to re-establishing the pristine state of his church and the honour of his whole land, as though born and called to this purpose by God."⁵⁰ He was as good as his word. His reasons, however, were varied. Undoubtedly first came his devotion to St. Davids, a devotion to which birth, early association, family connexions and a powerful historical imagination all contributed. At least four bishoprics had been offered to him,⁵¹ but his heart was set on one alone. He may well have thought, too, that the time was propitious. Richard had just died, and Gerald had been the companion and counsellor of the new King in Ireland in 1185, whilst in Wales the Lord Rhys had died two years before, leaving no successor. Giraldus may possibly have imagined himself as archbishop—the only archbishop of the Welsh—championing the moral regeneration of the clergy and the independence of a laity whose Welsh and English blood he combined in his own person. But if he had these ambitions he kept them, with a

⁵⁰ Op. I, 112. *ad reformandum ecclesiae suae statum pristinum patriaeque totius honorem, tanquam propter hoc natus et a Domino datus, se totum indubitanter et incunctanter applicaret.*

⁵¹ Ferns, Leighlin, Bangor, Llandaff.

rare restraint, to himself. John's favour failed him; Hubert Walter intimidated the chapter; Giraldus took the only possible course, appealed to the Pope and set out on the first of his three journeys to Rome.⁵²

For the next three years Giraldus exhausted his ingenuity, his friends and his income in an attempt to secure his double aim—his own confirmation as bishop and the standing of St. Davids. A good raconteur, he diverted without influencing the Pope; a good orator, his denunciations were more striking in form than in effect; best of all as a fighter, his vanity led him to interpret as signs of success what must often have been but pleasantries or sarcasms at his expense.

He sought first to convince Innocent that the revival of a metropolitan see in Wales would redound primarily to the advantage of the Roman Church; among the benefits would be Peter's Pence for every house amounting to more than 200 marks per annum, and the Great tithes of 3,000 marks.⁵³ He did not ask for full rights as a Primate, nor even for the pallium, but he did request independence of Canterbury for Wales, and added aptly that the Pope had before him the example of the Scottish Church which some eight years previously had been made a *filia specialis* of Rome, owing immediate subjection to the Pope alone.⁵⁴

None of his arguments carried weight. A man of the utmost caution and sagacity Innocent himself was fully alive to the value of centralization: his policy, if not always his interests, were in harmony with those of the strong western monarchs of his day. He created thirty-three cardinals, but during his pontificate not a single new archbishopric in the West

⁵² On his first visit he was at Rome by Nov. 30, 1199, returning before the end of 1200: on the second by March 4, 1201, returning before July, 1201: on the third by October/January, 1202/3, and back in England by August, 1203.

⁵³ Op. III, 175.

⁵⁴ *Handbook of British Chronology*, p. 208.

was set up.⁵⁵ In the first year of his reign he had deprived Dol of its pallium, and though Giraldus knew this, and tried to turn his knowledge to good purpose, it was scarcely likely that the Pope would antagonize John and Hubert Walter merely to gratify the ambition of a garrulous archdeacon by recognizing the national aspirations of a small rebellious folk. Behind Innocent's decision of April, 1203, lay the demands of statecraft and the traditions of his office. The end of the twelfth century was the age of the larger nations: it was the misfortune of Wales that geographically and politically its independence was of insufficient value in the scales at Rome. More than forty years later David of Wales was to find the same thing when he tried unsuccessfully to make his realm a fief of the papacy.⁵⁶

And so Giraldus lost his fight. It is true that the question of St. Davids was undecided, but it must have been plain to all men that further appeals to Rome would merely have protracted expensive litigation without the prospect of a settlement. Even Giraldus realized this, and in November 1203 he somewhat suddenly acquiesced in the election of Geoffrey de Henlaw to the see.⁵⁷ Shortly afterwards, in January 1204, he was reconciled to the King and archbishop,⁵⁸ resigned his archdeaconry and retired to write, and probably to embellish the account of his epic struggle.

His cause, indeed, had been from the outset hopeless. He came too late for success. From Rome he got no support, though Innocent seems to have liked him well enough. From

⁵⁵ The case of Antivari in Dalmatia was peculiar. See *Liber Censuum*, Introd., p. 46-55.

⁵⁶ Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora* (R.S.) IV. 398-99. See also F. M. Powicke, *King Henry III and the Lord Edward*, II. 634 n. 1.

⁵⁷ R.S.A., 53. Geoffrey did not have to promise not to raise the metropolitan question—this, at least, Giraldus secured. (Op. III, 324.) But in 1207 Innocent III pronounced the Welsh churches subject to Canterbury (H. & S., I, 452 and n.a.)

⁵⁸ Gerald had been denounced by the King for disturbing the peace of the realm, and proclaimed *inter inimicos nostros numerandum*. Patent Roll, 5 John (Record Comm., 1835, I, 34.)

his compatriots he got no backing that we know of;⁵⁹ from his own chapter, terrified by the King's anger and the King's agents, he had nothing but betrayal, opposition and repudiation. His fight was essentially his own, and his invective, his energy, his learning and his stratagems beat uselessly against the rock-like fixity of Canterbury. Paradoxically enough the primacy of St. Augustine's church was heightened and made more clear by this attempted rebellion on the part of St. Davids.

Writing probably in 1123 William of Malmesbury had said that to York belonged all the churches north of the Humber, with those of Scotland and the Orkneys; to Canterbury those of Ireland and Wales.⁶⁰ But the synod of Kells in 1152 had determined that the Church in Ireland should be organized under the four Irish metropolitans, and though Henry II and his sons disposed of Irish sees,⁶¹ no attempt had been made to make Armagh acknowledge Canterbury as Primate. In the case of Scotland there had been a more determined effort to subjugate the Scottish Church to the English, particularly after the capture of William the Lion in 1174. But that subjection, provided for in the treaties of Falaise and York,⁶² was never enforced. In practice Scottish independence was too strong, and the agreement between Richard I and William in 1189 was followed three years later by Celestine III's Bull recognizing that independence for the Church.

Scotland and Ireland thus both escaped domination, and politically, too, their independence survived the imperialism of the Plantagenet Kings. The two freedoms, the national and

⁵⁹ It is only fair to add that Gerald himself tells us that the Welsh more than appreciated his great efforts: a Bard declared amid applause . . . *quamdiu Wallia stabit nobile factum hujus et per historias scriptas et per ora canentium dignis per tempora cuncta laudibus atque praeconiis efferetur.* (Op. I, 128.).

⁶⁰ H. & S., I, 308.

⁶¹ *Gesta Regis Henrici II*, I, 103.

⁶² *Ib.* I, 96-97.

the ecclesiastical, cannot be dissociated.⁶³ Within England itself the martyrdom of Becket had enhanced enormously the prestige of his see, and it should always be remembered that the primacy of his Church was one of Becket's chief obsessions.⁶⁴

It was within this framework of complicated legal position, national aspirations and personal intrigue that the struggle of Giraldus against the primacy of Canterbury took its place and played its part. That part may well have been magnified by its author, but that it was not negligible is borne out by the testimony of one of his adversaries. Gervase of Canterbury had no uncritical regard for Hubert Walter, but in his *Acta Pontificum Cantuariensis* he mentions the controversy which Gerald had raised through hatred and contempt of the archbishop, seeking to withdraw seven sees from their obedience to the Primate. He describes the defeat and then the reconciliation of Giraldus, and concludes: *Dicant alii quod voluerint de operibus Huberti, ego istud maximum censeo, quod episcopos septem in subjectione retinuit Cantuariensis ecclesia, et rebellem Giraldi (Gelardi) contrivit astutiam.*⁶⁵

⁶³ In 1170 Henry II had claimed that the archbishopric of Bourges should belong to the duchy of Aquitaine. Louis VII rebutted the claim. (*Ib.* I, 10.)

⁶⁴ The title *totius Angliae primas* was apparently first claimed for an Archbishop of York (Geoffrey Plantagenet) in 1199. (Hoveden, IV, 90.)

⁶⁵ Gervase of Canterbury (*Actus Pontificum*), II, 412.

THE MOSCOW RESOLUTION ON ANGLICAN ORDERS, 1948

FROM A CORRESPONDENT

IN no subject perhaps is the relativity of translation more obvious than in that of theology. Indeed, some part of the blame for the misunderstandings which preceded and gave rise to the schism between East and West may be laid upon the translators who did not in fact translate the Greek into Latin without the meaning of certain vital terms undergoing a modification and change. By inadequate translation confusion may easily become worse confounded.

This English translation of a Russian document, which is written in difficult and somewhat clumsy language, cannot claim exemption from the fate of all translations, not least since it is made from a tongue already so far away from English. It has, however, been fairly liberally provided with notes so that difficult or doubtful words may be explained as far as possible according to their essential connotations in the Russian.

Not only is the literal vocabulary of English and Russian Churchmen different: the whole background of Russian Orthodox thought and theology differs very greatly from that of all Western Christians of whatever sort they be, and naturally agrees more nearly with that of the Greek and other Eastern Orthodox peoples with whom they hold Orthodoxy as a common treasure. Therefore not only actual words but whole categories of thought are different. Difficult as it may be to translate words, it is yet more difficult to enter into and to understand the different categories traditionally used to express the common beliefs and ways of life of Eastern and Western Christendom.

One such example of a different method of approach

between East and West to the mystery of the faith is found in the respective attitudes of the Orthodox East and the Catholic West towards the Sacrament of Holy Order. For the Orthodox, only those Orders which exist within the context of the faith and life of the Orthodox Church can be officially recognized: the provenance of such a view is obvious, proceeding as it does from the days of the "Undivided Church". The Orthodox maintain that Roman Catholics, Armenians, Syrian-Orthodox (Jacobite) and Copts are all, officially speaking, schismatic, and, though in practice their Orders may be recognized as grace-bearing, in theory any priest acceding to Orthodoxy from any of these bodies may be reordained and must in any case be formally reconciled.

Thus it is seen that the Orthodox are exclusive; but theirs is an exclusiveness which proceeds from a primitive inclusiveness that did in fact attempt to include all bodies of Christians except those which were schismatic and heretical; and schismatics were not officially excluded, but their status was left undefined.

As a "Church" the Anglican Communion claims to be corporately integral to the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church of the first eight centuries but is necessarily regarded as a *terra incognita* by the Orthodox who, in principle, cannot pronounce judgement upon the ministry, sacraments, etc., of any "heterodox" Church unless and until that Church affirms full dogmatic agreement with the Orthodox Church. From the Orthodox point of view it may be said that, on the one hand, Anglicanism was a reaction against an already existing (Roman) schism; on the other hand it shows unmistakable traces of Protestant influence. Finally it has never taken the step of identifying itself with Orthodoxy which from the Orthodox point of view would be its natural end. With this view should be compared and contrasted the assumption, fairly widely found in Anglicanism, that Protestant bodies should be encouraged to adopt the historic episcopate.

Not even in the case of the Roman Catholic Church has the Orthodox Church ever formally and officially committed

herself to a statement concerning the "validity" of non-Orthodox Ordinations. Much less then should we expect that, knowing far less historically of Canterbury than she does of Rome, her representatives would, without close and regular first-hand contact, be found to pronounce positively on the question of the "validity" of Anglican Orders, "validity being a concept which for the Orthodox is inseparable from union in the Faith and in the Sacraments."

What then, it may be asked, was the significance of the declarations concerning Anglican Orders made by the Church of Constantinople and certain other autokephalous Churches since 1922 ?¹ It is that, in individual cases of Anglican clerics acceding to Orthodoxy, "economy" may be exercised. "Economy", according to the report *Lambeth Conference 1948* (see footnote to p. 70 which refers to the *Lambeth Conference 1930* p. 128), "is a technical term representing administrative action to meet a temporary situation without prejudice to any principle of ecclesiastical order." In this respect those Churches which pronounced positively upon the question of Anglican Orders agreed to regard them in the same category as the orders of the Roman Catholic and Lesser Eastern Churches: i.e., that priests may be accepted as priests without reordination in the event of reconciliation in faith with the Orthodox Church either individually or collectively. The Orthodox Church, as it is at present constituted, cannot commit itself to judgement *per se* upon the Orders and Sacraments of those who are not one with it in faith, whatever the reason for such divergence on questions of faith.

It is relevant to point out here that the reports, read at the Moscow Church Conference, on which the resolution appears to be based reveal in fact an incomplete understanding and appreciation of the Anglican ethos and of the nature of Anglicanism. It has been hoped that exploratory and explanatory conversations would be held before any official pronouncements were made, but this unfortunately proved impossible.

¹ Reference may be made to *Orthodox Statements on Anglican Orders*, ed. E. R. Hardy, Junr.

At the same time, it should be remembered that only an Oecumenical Council (or at least the unanimous agreement) of all the autocephalous Orthodox Churches can be regarded as bearing the full weight of Orthodox authority. The Moscow Church Conference did not possess, nor did it claim, this completely representative and official character.

This particular resolution therefore, interesting and informative as it is, has not more than a limited local authority. As such its friendly and eirenic tone is to be particularly noted in contrast with some of the other resolutions of the Conference.

[Translation of Text.]

[N.B. Numbers in this section refer to "Notes" below.]

RESOLUTION ON THE QUESTION "OF ANGLICAN ORDERS."¹

"Having heard the reports² 'Concerning Anglican Orders', the Conference of Heads and Representatives of Orthodox autocephalous Churches, with a feeling of Christian goodwill and brotherly love for Anglican Christians in their searches for a way towards the recognition of the validity³ of Anglican Orders, decrees that:

"1. The doctrine contained in the 'Thirty-Nine Articles' of the Anglican Church differs markedly from the dogmas, doctrine and tradition confessed by the Orthodox Church; whereas the solution of the question of the recognition of the validity of Anglican Orders must first of all be based upon a doctrine of the sacraments which agrees with Orthodoxy. Personal expressions of agreement by members of the Anglican hierarchy to a modification of the teaching of these 'Articles' concerning the sacraments in the direction of an approach to Orthodoxy cannot serve as a basis for the solution of the question in a positive sense. Therefore, if the Orthodox Church cannot consent to recognize the rightness of Anglican teaching on sacraments in general and on the sacrament of Holy Order in particu-

lar, neither can she recognize as valid³ the Anglican ordinations⁴ that have taken place. If the Churches of Constantinople, Jerusalem, Cyprus, Rumania and other autocephalous Churches have expressed their favourable opinion on the recognition of the validity³ of Anglican ordinations⁴, we have information that this recognition was conditional.

“ 2. The question of the recognition of the validity³ of Anglican Orders¹ can be examined only in connexion with the question of unity of faith and confession with the Orthodox Church, an authoritative pronouncement of the Anglican Church being made on this subject and proceeding from a council or conference of the clergy of the Anglican Confession with subsequent confirmation of this by the Head of the Anglican Church; such a pronouncement does not yet exist. In this connexion, we express the desire that the Anglican Church should alter its teaching of faith from the points of view of dogma, canon law and ecclesiology⁵ and in particular its actual⁶ conception of the holy sacraments and more especially of the sacrament of Ordination.⁴

“ 3. Regarding with all attention and sympathy the contemporary movement among many representatives of Anglicanism towards the restoration of relations and communion of the faithful of the Anglican Church with the Universal⁷ Church, we state that the contemporary Anglican hierarchy can receive from the Orthodox Church recognition of the grace⁸ of its Orders⁹ if, first, a formally expressed unity of faith and confession is established (as stated above) between the Orthodox and Anglican Churches. Such longed-for unity being established, recognition of the validity³ of Anglican Ordinations can be realized according to the principle of Economy by the only authoritative means possible for us, a decision in Council¹⁶ of the whole Holy Orthodox Church.

“ We pray that, through the ineffable mercy of God, this may be accomplished, and that the Lord may grant the spirit of love and good will which moves men to good works to the glory of his Holy Church.”

NOTES.

1. *ierarkhia*, literally "hierarchy", is used here in the wide sense to denote the orders bestowed by hierarchical action. Cf. notes 4 and 9.

2. *doklady*, reports. Those on which the Resolution was based were:—

(a) Report by the Metropolitan Nicodemus (from the Bulgarian Church) "On Anglican Orders."

(b) Report by the Archpriest Professor Peter Vintilescu (from the Rumanian Church) "Anglican Orders and their Validity."

(c) Report by Professor V. Vertogradov (Moscow Theological Academy) "On Anglican Orders."

3. *deistvitelnost*, is usually translated "validity," though the Russian word does not bear exactly the same meaning as the English, not least because the Eastern ways of theological thought on this, as on so many other subjects, do not correspond to those familiar to Christians in the West. Etymologically, the word denotes rather "efficacy," "effectivity," "activity," "that which works" or "is operative." It is, however, impossible to use any of these words with reference to Holy Order in a sense which would be generally understood in English, and to substitute another word for that commonly used might easily make confusion worse confounded.

4. *khirotonia*, has been translated throughout by "ordination." It refers primarily to the consecration of a bishop, in which sense the word is usually employed, but by implication may be extended in a more general sense which from the context is clearly intended here. Cf. notes 1 and 9.

5. *ecclesiologitcheskoy*, "ecclesiological." Anglican doctrine concerning the Church and its nature and characteristics is clearly what the authors of the Resolution have in mind here.

6. *podlinoye*, [actual] a word difficult to render satisfactorily in English in this place. According to varying contexts it may mean "actual," "original," "authentic," "true," "real," "first-hand," "genuine."

7. *vselensky*, means "universal." It is also translated

“oecumenical” and is the word always used to denote an Oecumenical Council.

8. *blagodatnost'*, [grace] derived from *blagodat'*, “grace,” cannot be fully translated. The reference is to the grace-bearing quality of true Orders, cf. note 9.

9. *svyashchenstvo* [Orders], is normally but not exclusively used for “priesthood” (*svyashchenik* = priest). The phrase used in Russian equivalent to the English “to take Holy Orders” is “*prinyat'* [to receive] *svyashchenstvo*”, cf. notes 1 and 4.

10. *sobor*, a Council (or, by derivation, a cathedral or large church) is the word used for a solemnly convoked and officially held Council; it is always employed in the translation of “Oecumenical Council” into Russian, cf. *sovyeshchaniye* [conference or congress], the word used in the first line of the Resolution, and *s'yezd* [conference].

CORRESPONDENCE ILLUSTRATING RECENT RELATIONS BETWEEN CANTERBURY AND MOSCOW.

A. CANTERBURY TO MOSCOW.

Lambeth Palace, S.E.1.
13th January, 1947.

His Beatitude,

Alexy, Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia,
Russian Orthodox Patriarchate,
Moscow.

Beloved Brother in Christ,

Grace and peace be to you from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ.

As Your Beatitude well knows, the Church of England, together with the whole Anglican Communion throughout the world, considers it to be its duty and vocation before God that it should constantly devote its energies and efforts towards the realization of the ideal of unity amongst Christian people, which is so evidently taught by our Blessed Lord in the Holy scriptures. The problems and difficulties of the present age make even more urgent the fulfilment of our Lord's prayer “that all may be one”. The hope of

closer relations with other Christian bodies is one which is deeply rooted in the hearts of faithful Anglicans throughout the world. A notable expression of this hope was given by the conference of Anglican bishops from all over the world, when they met for the Lambeth Conference in 1920. This conference issued an "Appeal to all Christian people", in which it appealed to all Christians to "unite in a new and great endeavour to recover and to manifest to the world the unity of the Body of Christ for which he prayed." This message from the 252 bishops there assembled under the Providence of God has not been without fruit, and I thank God that the action of our Communion has been allowed to contribute towards the new spirit of brotherly love which has so notably developed between Christians of different traditions during the last twenty-five and more years.

Not the least of the blessings which God has granted is the growth of close brotherly relations with our beloved fellow Christians of the Orthodox Churches. This development has been the cause of great satisfaction to me and to members of the Anglican Communion. In past centuries there have been many contacts between the Orthodox Churches and the Church of England, and many Anglicans have felt an especial bond of sympathy in ideals of worship, order and tradition with their brethren of the Orthodox Faith.

As a result of the Lambeth Conference appeal of 1920 and of the visits to England of several important leaders of the Orthodox Church, the Holy Synod of the Great Church of Constantinople, on July 22nd, 1922, passed the following Declaration:

"Most Reverend Archbishop of Canterbury and chief Hierarchy of all England, Brother, beloved and yearned for in Christ our God, Lord Randall, greetings: your Reverence well-beloved by us, fraternally in the Lord, we address you with gladness.

"Our special committee dealing with the Union of the Churches has drawn our attention and that of our Holy Synod to the question of the validity of Anglican ordinations from the Orthodox point of view, for that it would be profitable in regard to the whole question of union that the opinion of the Holy Orthodox Church should be known upon this matter.

"Accordingly the Holy Synod on this opportunity takes under our presidency the matter under consideration, and, having examined it from every point of view, has concluded that, as before the Orthodox Church, the ordinations of the Anglican Episcopal confession of Bishops, priests and deacons, possess the same validity as those of the Roman, Old Catholic, and Armenian Churches possess, inasmuch as all essentials are found in them which are held indispensable from the Orthodox point of view for

the recognition of the 'Charisma' of the priesthood derived from Apostolic succession.

"Indeed, on the one hand, it is plain that there is no matter here as yet of a decree by the whole Orthodox Church. For it is necessary that the rest of the Orthodox Churches should be found to be of the same opinion (in the matter) as the Most Holy Church of Constantinople.

"But even so it is an event not without significance that the Synod of one, and that the Primatial Throne of the Orthodox Churches, when taking the matter into consideration, has come to this conclusion.

"Therefore with great joy we communicate the matter to Your Beloved Grace as the Chief Hierarchy of the whole Anglican Church, being sure that your Grace will be equally favourably disposed towards this conclusion, as recognizing in it a step forward in that work of general union which is dear to God.

"May the Heavenly Father grant unto us to be of the same mind, through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is blessed for ever and ever.

"July 28, 1922.

"Your well-beloved Grace's beloved brother in Christ, and altogether well disposed,

“✠ MELETIOS.”

The Oecumenical Patriarch also sent an encyclical letter to the other Churches of the Eastern Orthodox Church, to the various Patriarchs and chiefs, communicating to them the facts of what his Synod had agreed upon. (Document No. 1 attached.)²

In the following year the Orthodox Church of Jerusalem wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury endorsing the conclusion of the encyclical letter. (See Document No. 2 attached.)³

The Church of Cyprus, also, concurred in the decisions of the Oecumenical Patriarchate. In 1931, the Patriarchate of Alexandria acted on the recommendation of its delegate to the Lambeth Conference of 1930, and notified the Oecumenical Patriarchate of its acceptance of Anglican Orders.

As a result of conversations with the Rumanian Orthodox Church in 1935 (Document No. 3 attached)⁴ "the Rumanian Orthodox Commission unanimously recommended the Holy Synod (of the

² Hardy, pp. 3 ff.

³ Hardy, pp. 6 f.

⁴ Hardy, pp. 14 ff.

Rumanian Orthodox Church) to recognize the validity of the Anglican Orders". This recommendation was implemented in the following year after acceptance by the canonical authorities of the Rumanian Orthodox Church and of the Church of England.

In addition to the above decisions, conversations have taken place between representatives of the Church of England and representatives of the Greek, Serbian and Bulgarian Orthodox Churches, but these Churches have not yet expressed themselves definitively on the subject of Anglican Ordinations.

In view of the fact that conversations and discussions have now taken place during a considerable number of years, it would appear to be desirable that if possible some steps should be taken for the purpose of reaching a generally agreed understanding on this question of Anglican Ordinations, with those Orthodox Churches which have not yet expressed a final opinion. Amongst these, the Holy Orthodox Church of Russia particularly claims our attention, because formal conversations have not recently taken place between the Church of England and the Russian Orthodox Church, and because I am anxious that the warm brotherly relations existing between our two Churches should be further strengthened and developed as much as possible.

The value of such agreements on the subject of Anglican Ordinations seems to me to reside chiefly in the fact that they provide an official recognition from each Church that the other Church is of a similar ethos, and that, whatever differences in expression may exist between them, there is also a notable and acknowledged bond of unity.

I would therefore suggest to Your Beatitude that action should be taken to discuss the question of Anglican Ordinations between representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church and the Anglican Communion. For this purpose, I should be ready to nominate four or five learned theologians to act as a delegation, and to discuss the question with a similar delegation to be nominated by Your Beatitude. Such a discussion, which would, I suppose, occupy about one week, might take place either in Russia or in London. If Your Beatitude thought fit to send a delegation here, I should be most happy to welcome them and to make suitable arrangements for their discussions. If, on the other hand, Your Beatitude would prefer the conversations to take place in the Soviet Union, I will appoint a delegation to visit your country for that purpose.

As to the time of such an event, it would be most convenient if the discussions could take place some time during the summer, perhaps between Easter and September, the exact date to be fixed as soon as Your Beatitude has decided on the matter. The Anglican

Delegation would include at least one bishop, and I shall be happy to decide the names and send them to Your Beatitude as soon as I hear that the proposal commends itself to you. I should also be pleased to supply Your Beatitude with any information you may desire regarding the conversations which have already taken place between the Church of England and other Orthodox Churches.

The next Lambeth Conference is planned for 1948, when it is expected that between 300 and 400 Anglican bishops from all over the world will be present in London. I earnestly hope that the Russian Orthodox Church will be represented at the opening ceremonies on that occasion by an eminent member of your hierarchy. The official invitation to send a representative will be conveyed to Your Beatitude at a later stage, together with all the necessary particulars of date and time.

At a later date I shall also be writing to the Bulgarian Orthodox Church and the Serbian Orthodox Church on the same subject, and it is my hope that a general advance may be made in relations with these Churches.

Please accept, Your Beatitude, my warm good wishes and prayers for yourself, your Church and faithful people, and my earnest hope for the growth of even closer relations between our two Churches.

I am, Your Beatitude's loving brother in Christ,

GEOFFREY

Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of All
England and Metropolitan.

B. MOSCOW TO CANTERBURY.

[Translation.]

Your Grace,

With love once more I greet you with the joyful Paschal words:
Christ is risen!

May the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God the Father and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost be always with you.

We have received your kind letters and I am availing myself of the present opportunity to answer them.

In one of them you call us to accept the invitation of the World Council of Churches to the Russian Orthodox Church to take part in the Oecumenical movement and in the other you express a thought concerning the desirability of discussion by the Russian Orthodox Church of the question of the validity [lawfulness] of Anglican Ordination.

We are glad to answer you that we have taken a decision to discuss both these questions at the Church Council convened by us in autumn 1947 in Moscow.

We hope that, with the gracious co-operation of the Holy Spirit, we shall at that Council discuss these questions in a conciliar [*soborny*] way in conformity with Holy Tradition and the canons of the Holy Orthodox Church and that we shall come to a unanimous ecclesiastical solution of them. We hope that Your Grace will be in agreement with this our decision.

As far as your notification about the forthcoming Lambeth Conference in 1948 is concerned, the question concerning participation in it will be discussed by us on the receipt of notification from the World Council of Churches.

With brotherly love in Christ

✠ ALEXY, Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia.

P.S. I was glad to receive the Canon⁵ and have a talk with him. I am sending your Grace according to our Russian custom an Easter Egg (red) and also request you to accept my portrait as a souvenir.

P. A.

18th April, 1947.

Moscow.

C. CANTERBURY TO MOSCOW.

Lambeth Palace, S.E.1.

16th May, 1947.

His Beatitude Alexy

Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia,

Russian Orthodox Patriarchate,

U.S.S.R.

Your Beatitude, Beloved Brother in Christ,

I thank you most warmly for your letter, and for your kind thought in sending me the Easter Egg, which is a very attractive present, and also your photograph which I am specially glad to have. I am glad to know of your hope of further discussions with others

⁵ C. W. Hutchinson, temporary Chaplain, British Embassy, Moscow.

before arranging any conference with us. This I fully understand, and I pray God that He may bless your plans and deliberations to the good of His Kingdom and of all Christian people.

The final paragraph in your letter, however, seemed to indicate that there was some confusion about my position in relation to the Lambeth Conference on the one hand and my quite different relation to the World Council of Churches on the other. You will, I hope, forgive me if I explain a little more in detail about them. It is best to err on the side of too much explanation rather than too little.

The Lambeth Conference has no connexion at all with the World Council of Churches. The Lambeth Conference is a purely Anglican gathering, and normally takes place every ten years. On these occasions all the bishops of the Anglican Communion throughout the world (about 350 in number) are invited to come to London in order to confer about matters of common interest to the Anglican Communion. At the Conferences held in 1920 and 1930 distinguished Orthodox representatives were happily able to be present, but they did not come as members of the Conference, nor did they take part in the deliberations of the Conference. They had some useful discussions which were later reported to the Conference, and their presence at a special service was symbolic of the close friendship which happily exists between us.

If Your Beatitude were able to send a representative on the occasion of the Lambeth Conference, at which we hope to welcome other Orthodox visitors, he would come as an honoured guest to be present for a short period to demonstrate our friendly relations. The invitation to this Conference will be issued later.

The World Council of Churches is quite another matter. The Assembly to be held in Amsterdam in 1948 will be the first ever to be held and over 100 Christian bodies will be represented. The Church of England and some if not all of the other provinces of the Anglican Communion will be represented at the Assembly, but their representatives will form no more than a small minority among all the Delegates. This Assembly will discuss various subjects of interest to Christendom as a whole, but neither the Church of England nor other Christian bodies represented there will be in any way committed to any decision which may be taken on statements which may be issued by the Assembly.

The World Council of Churches is at present in an early stage of its development, and is an attempt to express the unity which is common to all Christians in spite of their manifold and important ecclesiastical differences. My own position is that I am one of

five joint Presidents (another of whom is Archbishop Germanos), and I shall attend the Assembly in this capacity. Dr. Visser 't Hooft is the Secretary of the World Council of Churches which is organizing the Assembly.

I hope this short resumé will clarify the situation.

Please accept, Your Beatitude, my prayers and good wishes for you and your Church.

I am Your Beloved Brother in Christ,

GEOFFREY

Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of All
England and Metropolitan.

D. MOSCOW TO CANTERBURY.

[Cable 27.6.47.]

Archbishop of Canterbury Primate of All England Metropolitan,
Lambeth Palace, London.

Receive your letter thank your explanations, send Your Grace
prayers good wishes for you your Church.

Patriarche ALEXY.

E. CANTERBURY TO MOSCOW.

Lambeth Palace, S.E.1.

November 24th, 1947.

His Beatitude Alexy

Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia.

Moscow,
U.S.S.R.

Beloved Brother in Christ,

Grace and peace from God our Father and our Lord Jesus
Christ.

Your Beatitude will doubtless be aware of the fact that, in
accordance with custom, the great Conference, normally held every

ten years, of the bishops of the whole Anglican Communion throughout the world will once more be assembled here at Lambeth, if it be God's will, in July of next year, Anno Domini 1948.

This Conference will open with services of worship in Canterbury Cathedral on Thursday, July 1st, and in St. Paul's Cathedral, London, on Sunday, July 4th. It will meet in plenary session during the week Monday, July 5th—Friday, July 9th, and thereafter for the space of three weeks in Committee. The Conference will be divided into groups to consider various subjects touching the spiritual and moral conditions of the Church and of the world. After meeting again in full session for two weeks the Conference will close on Sunday, August 8th, with a service of thanksgiving in Westminster Abbey.

Of the matters for discussion at the Conference one of the most important will be the question how best, for the service of Almighty God and for the work of the Kingdom of Christ, we can strengthen still further those ties of sympathy and understanding which already exist between the Anglican Communion and other Christians throughout the world.

With none do we desire more sincerely to grow in mutual understanding and brotherhood than with the Holy Orthodox Churches of the East. It has been a great satisfaction to us that since our last Lambeth Conference in 1930 personal knowledge and common fellowship have been increased between the members of the Anglican Communion and those of the Orthodox Churches. The various Conferences, meetings and interchange of visits which have taken place in recent years have given full evidence that our hearts are at one in desiring closer fellowship.

I am therefore writing to Your Beatitude as the head of the Russian Orthodox Church to invite you to be present at the opening services, to confer with certain of our bishops before the plenary sessions begin, as well as with members of the Church of England Council on Foreign Relations, and to be received in a special session on Saturday, July 3rd, by the full membership of the Lambeth Conference itself. Should it unhappily be impossible for you to come personally, we should welcome a representative of Your Beatitude in your stead.

I am sending a similar invitation to the heads of the other autocephalous Orthodox Churches, and it is our earnest desire to be able to welcome at Lambeth a delegation representing our beloved brethren of all the Orthodox Churches.

I should be glad if these representatives could be in England from Saturday, June 26th, to Tuesday, July 6th. I shall of course make myself responsible for securing reception and hospitality during your stay or that of your representative, though the difficulties of

post-war reconstruction in England inevitably place certain restrictions on our hospitality to our great regret.

Your Beatitude will recognize the many benefits which by the blessing of God might follow the association, before Him and before all the world, of the Holy Orthodox Churches with the Anglican Lambeth Conference. We cannot ask even Orthodox bishops, or those of any other Church, to be members of the Lambeth Conference itself. But we can and do hereby ask you or your representative to join us in prayer and in consultation.

May the All-wise and All-mighty God pour His blessings upon Your Beatitude. May He continue to protect the Church over which He has placed Your Beatitude. Praying with you that we may by God's grace advance towards the day when all who believe in and love the One Lord and Saviour of us all may indeed be one,

I remain,

Your Beatitude's Beloved Brother and Servant,

GEOFFREY

Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of All
England and Metropolitan.

F. MOSCOW TO CANTERBURY.

[Translation.]

Your Grace,

We have received your kind letter of November 24th, 1947, (received by us only in January of this year).

I thank you for the brotherly invitation to join in prayer and consultation, by which the coming Lambeth Conference will be preceded.

Our Russian Orthodox Church both previously, from ancient times, and more recently has not been accustomed to take part in the consultations of non-Orthodox Churches which concern their own ecclesiastical affairs and questions and are, so to say, extraneous for the Orthodox Church. Thus, now also, when we are especially busy both with the domestic arrangement of our ecclesiastical affairs and with wide correspondence concerning the affairs of our Orthodox ecclesiastical communities abroad, there is no possibility for us to spare the

time for participation in the consultations undertaken by you.

May our Lord prosper you in this work with His Grace and heavenly assistance.

With brotherly love devoted to Your Grace in Christ,

✠ ALEXIS Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia.

16th February, 1948.

Moscow.

G. CANTERBURY TO MOSCOW.

Lambeth Palace, S.E.1.

18th March, 1948.

His Beatitude Alexy

Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia,

Moscow,

U.S.S.R.

Your Beatitude,

Thank you for your letter of the 16th February, 1948, on the subject of the Lambeth Conference.

It will of course be a great disappointment to our people that you are unable to visit us at the beginning of the Conference, but I fully understand that the manifold activities of your Patriarchate will prevent your coming to England. I am personally very sorry not to have the chance of meeting you or your representative.

I have thought it well to write again in order to clarify a point which my first letter did not perhaps make sufficiently clear. The object of inviting a representative of your Patriarchate to the opening ceremonies of the Conference was to show honour to the Russian Orthodox Church and to express the friendliness and brotherly feeling existing between our two Churches. Our foreign visitors will not be asked to take part in any discussions with the Lambeth Conference. In fact it is impossible to ask them to do so. The programme for our visitors from abroad involves only the ceremonial attendance at the Conference Services and a ceremonial reception at the Conference itself on July 3rd, but no discussions there.

It was thought that some of our visitors might perhaps be desirous of having some informal discussions about Anglican-Orthodox relations with Anglicans while they are in this country, and facilities will therefore be arranged for this. But no visitor will be expected to take part in such talks unless he wishes to do so, and

these talks form no part of the reason for which guests have been invited.

You will, I hope, find this explanation useful as making more precise the exact purpose of the invitation to you and to other Churches which have been asked.

May God pour His blessing upon all your work for the cause of Christ.

With brotherly love to Your Beatitude and with prayers for you and your faithful people,

Yours sincerely in Jesus Christ,

GEOFFREY

Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of All
England and Metropolitan.

H. CANTERBURY TO MOSCOW.

Lambeth Palace, S.E.1.

3rd July, 1948.

His Beatitude Alexy

Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia,

Moscow 34, U.S.S.R.

Chisty Pereulok d.5.

Peace and love from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.

Beloved Brother in Christ,

It is with great pleasure and deep feeling that we address to you this letter which will be carried to you by our most respected and deeply loved brother, the Most Reverend Germanos, Metropolitan of Thyateira and Apokrisarios of the Oecumenical Patriarch to the Archbishop of Canterbury. As soon as we heard from him that he was to visit Moscow, we asked him to do us the service of conveying this letter, which he readily undertook to do.

We have heard with the greatest interest and delight of the celebrations which are about to take place in Moscow for the 500th anniversary of the autocephaly of the Russian Orthodox Church. The history of your Church is a splendid one and it has made signal contributions to the life of Christendom through the many centuries of its existence.

The many famous names which adorn the glorious history of the Russian Orthodox Church recall to us the greatness and true Christian character of its history and traditions. The manifold gifts of your great predecessor St. Philip and his life of devotion were a

worthy example of Christian spirituality and of loving care for Church and people. Other names of mighty men of God adorn the list of the Russian Church leaders—the Patriarchs Alexei, Hermogen, Nikon and Philaret spring at once to mind as exemplifying the rich and varied personalities born and nourished in the Holy Orthodox Church of Russia.

In recent times too God has shown His power and grace in your two immediate predecessors, the Patriarchs Tikhon and Sergei. In particular we remember with heartfelt thanks the happy relations which our dear brother the Archbishop of York was able to establish with the Patriarch Sergei and the deep impression of spiritual devotion which the Patriarch made upon his English guests.

But it is not only in its rulers that the Russian Orthodox Church has shown its glory. In saintly life and in theological work the Russian Church has brought great gifts to the service of God's people. The name of St. Sergei of Radonezh is familiar to all those who know the great saints of God. An earlier Archbishop of York when visiting Russia nearly fifty years ago had the privilege of kneeling at the shrine of St. Sergei and of paying a tribute to his memory and thanking God for so bountifully giving His gifts to men and to His Church. We too kneel in humble thanksgiving for the saintly life of St. Sergei and for the lives of many other Saints who have adorned the Russian Orthodox Church since the glorious days of St. Vladimir.

Christendom has also been enriched by the contributions of Russian theologians amongst whom we will only mention the great Alexei Khomiakov. Many Christians outside the bounds of Russia have cause to be thankful for their notable writings.

All these, and many other glories, come to our mind as we think with brotherly sympathy and love of you and your Church, our dear Brethren, in this great moment of your life.

We are writing not only on our own behalf and on behalf of the Church of England but also as the spokesman of 329 bishops of our Anglican Communion throughout the world who are gathered here at Lambeth in conference. It is a happy coincidence that we are able to send our heartfelt greetings on this occasion.

Praying fervently that the Lord will continue to pour His blessings upon Your Beatitude, your clergy and your people, we ask God to give you all His Grace and to grant Your Beatitude many years.

I remain,

Your sincere loving brother in Christ,

GEOFFREY

Archbishop of Canterbury,
Primate of All England and Metropolitan.

I. MOSCOW TO CANTERBURY.

[Translation]

To His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Your Grace,

In conformity with the wish expressed by you last year that the Russian Orthodox Church should examine the question of the recognition of the validity of the Orders of the Anglican Church, we considered this question at the Church Conference of bishops and representatives of the autocephalous Orthodox Churches from the 8th to the 17th of July this year in Moscow. As an answer to your request we are sending you a copy of the Resolution of the Conference concerning the given question. This resolution is signed by the bishops and representatives of the Orthodox autocephalous Churches who were participators in the Church Conference.

The Russian Orthodox Church intends to have the most friendly and brotherly relations in Christ with the Anglican Church henceforward also. The Russian Orthodox Church does not lose hope that, with God's help, the Anglican Church will be able in the not distant future to surmount or change those canonical obstacles which for the present have not permitted us to recognize the validity of the Orders of the Anglican Church.

May the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God the Father, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost be with the faithful of the Anglican Church evermore.

Your Grace's co-brother in Christ,

ALEXIS

Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia.

1948. August 2.
Moscow.

J. CANTERBURY TO MOSCOW.

Amsterdam, 31st August, 1948.

His Beatitude, Alexy, Patriarch of
Moscow and All Russia.
Russian Orthodox Patriarchate,
Moscow,

Your Beatitude, Beloved Brother in Christ,

I have received your letter of the 2nd August, for which I

heartily thank you. It has reached me while I am at Amsterdam for the World Council of Churches Conference, which itself followed immediately after the five weeks of the Lambeth Conference. Owing to the severe strain of this prolonged period of work I find it necessary to go away on holiday for a few weeks as soon as the Assembly of the World Council of Churches has ended. On my return I shall give to your letter and your enclosure the careful attention which it deserves.

It was my desire, however, to send to Your Beatitude an immediate acknowledgement of your communication, and I hope that you will excuse me if there is some slight delay in my full reply.

Please accept my assurance of warm brotherly feelings for you and your Church and of my prayers that God will bless and guide both you and all its faithful members.

Your sincere brother,

GEOFFREY

Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of All
England and Metropolitan.

K. CANTERBURY TO MOSCOW.

Lambeth Palace, S.E.1.
15th February, 1949.

His Beatitude Alexey,
Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia,
Moscow Patriarchate,
Moscow 34,
Chisty Pereulok d.5,
U.S.S.R.

Your Beatitude, Beloved Brother in Christ,

It has now been possible for me to give fuller consideration to your letter of August 2nd, 1948, and to the resolution about Anglican Ordinations which accompanied it.

Your firm desire that those bonds and brotherly ties which have united our Churches in the past shall be maintained and strengthened in the future brings great joy to me. Through the fact that they have been separated from one another by long centuries, Orthodox and Anglicans have not unnaturally developed differences in their respective presentations of the one eternal Christian Gospel. In the providence of God, however, we have both been given insights into the

mystery of our holy faith, and in many ways these are similar and in other cases they fulfil one another.

All the more important, then, does it become to examine such points of difference which exist between us to see whether they spring from misunderstanding or perhaps from more radical causes. The particular difficulties raised in the actual resolution on the validity of Anglican Orders proceed, as it seems to me, from one or other of these causes and can be resolved only by further elucidation and, in due course, conversations and discussions between learned representatives of both our Churches, not for the purpose of negotiations at this stage, but solely for the purpose of exchanging views and information.

During past years discussions have taken place between theologians of the Anglican Communion and of various Orthodox Churches, some reports of which are available, as in the case of the Doctrinal Commission of 1931 and of the Conference with the Rumanian Church in 1935. The result of the discussions with the Rumanian Church came before the Convocations of the Church of England and was endorsed by them in 1936.

In 1930 preceding the Lambeth Conference there were conversations between the Patriarch of Alexandria, with other Orthodox representatives, and Anglican bishops, in which the Anglican bishops expounded the doctrine of the Church of England on the *mysterion* of Holy Orders and the status of the Thirty-Nine Articles in a way which our venerable Orthodox brethren found to be satisfactory. The Lambeth Conference of 1930 then passed a resolution, number 33 (c), in which, whilst disclaiming any profession to be a synod authorized to define doctrine, it "records its acceptance of the statements of the Anglican bishops contained therein as a sufficient account of the teaching and practice of the Church of England and of the Churches in communion with it, in relation to those subjects." I take it that it is this to which the Moscow resolution refers, a statement which, according to the bishops' own words, was not at that time an official definition of Anglican Church doctrine. The relevant documents are printed in *Lambeth Occasional Reports* 1931-8, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1948, pp. 203-5, a copy of which I am venturing to send to Your Beatitude separately by registered post.

The Lambeth Conference of 1930 also passed resolutions about the Old Catholic Churches. In consequence of this action discussions took place between Anglican and Old Catholic theologians and the following declaration was adopted by both sides and endorsed by the two Convocations of the Church of England (York—January 1932; Canterbury—January 20th and 22nd 1932):

1. Each Communion recognizes the catholicity and independence of the other and maintains its own.

2. Each Communion agrees to admit members of the other Communion to participate in the Sacraments.

3. Intercommunion does not require from either Communion the acceptance of all doctrinal opinion, sacramental devotion, or liturgical practice characteristic of the other, but implies that each believes the other to hold all the essentials of the Christian Faith.

This method seems to be a most fruitful one and would appear to offer valuable assistance in any further conversations which might take place with representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church. Your Beatitude will recall that in my letter of 18th March I suggested the holding of conversations between members of our respective Churches. I fully appreciate, of course, that in the difficulties of the present time such conversations may not be immediately practicable. I should like to assure Your Beatitude, however, that I shall always be ready to arrange for such talks whenever you may deem it convenient from your own point of view.

In order that Your Beatitude may be as fully informed as possible, I hope to despatch to you such books published in this country as would seem to me to serve towards interpreting events in the Church of England and the Anglican Communion. I hope Your Beatitude will accept these small efforts as a contribution to a mutual comprehension which will serve the cause of the unity of Christ's Church.

May the peace of God which passeth all understanding keep our hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God and of His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord.

With warm greetings to Your Beatitude personally as well as to the clergy and faithful people entrusted by the mercy of God to your care,

I remain,

Your Beatitude's brother in Christ,

GEOFFREY

Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of
All England and Metropolitan.

REVIEWS

THE LIFE OF REASON. By W. G. DE BURGH, sometime Professor of Philosophy in the University of Reading and Fellow of the British Academy. (Macdonald and Evans, 1949). Pp. xxiii + 219. Price 15s.

THIS is the book on which Professor de Burgh was at work at the time of his death, and it closes most fittingly with an expression of the motive which had led him to undertake it:

"My own experience, over more than half a century, has carried me, as a student and teacher of philosophy, into the realm of theory rather than into that of action. If therefore I have any qualification to write as an advocate of the Christian faith, it is the speculative aspect, and not the practical, that falls within my narrow competence. Believing as I do that in that faith alone lie the hope and promise for the world, I cannot, when I look back on that experience and what I have learnt from it, question the urgency of the obligation to use what strength remains to me in the closing years of life in drawing from it the materials for a constructive argument to the truth of the Christian Gospel, and for an answer to the speculative difficulties which, still after nineteen centuries, hinder so many acute and earnest thinkers from yielding to it their assent."

With this end in view Professor de Burgh set out "to survey the forms of rational activity, in both thought and conduct, not in order to reach an abstract definition, but in order to display the nature of reason as a unity of diverse functions, each of which exhibits rationality at its own level of theoretical or practical experience" (p. 4). He attacks the narrow view of reason which would confine it to the sphere of so-called scientific method. Science, history and art are all activities of speculative reason, law and morality of practical reason. These lead on into philosophy and religion which also, at their best, are rational activities.

In the first part, chapters are devoted in turn to discussing the mode in which science, history, art, philosophy and religion are activities of reason. The interest of science is in general laws, that of history in individual occurrences; each studies an aspect of reality. Art reveals yet another aspect: "only a small fragment of reality allows of clear and distinct expression in the propositions of history or science. Past events in the one case, the mea-

surable features of phenomena in the other, lend themselves naturally to precise verbal formulation. But behind and beneath lies a vast realm of being, none the less real for its obscurity and indetermination, demanding for its expression, if it can be expressed at all, other symbolic forms than those of speech or writing" (p. 77). Philosophical reflection on the deliverances of these three activities illuminates and is illuminated by insights gained from the practice of religion.

This part of the book concludes with a searching analysis of the relations between revelation, faith and reason. It is much to be regretted that after a section on *fides quaerens intellectum*, it ends with a note that "the argument in this chapter was left uncompleted. The writer had intended to add a third part under the heading *intellectus quaerens fidem*, a subject to which he had devoted much thought in the last years of his life." The whole book testifies to the dominant interest which this theme had for de Burgh, and his mature reflection upon it would have been of great value.

The second part traces the ascent of practical reason as man passes from infra-rational activity through the economic, legal and moral stages to religion:

"The difference, be it noted, is one of motive; self-interest and efficiency in the handling of practical situations, respect for the authority of the State, duty for duty's sake, or desire for an ideal good; and, in religion, the love of God. But motive is integral to action, and a difference in the one entails difference in the other. 'Manners Makyth Man'—so runs Wykeham's famous motto; the thing done, and not only the doer, differs according to the way of doing it." (p. 161).

As the first part had led into the chapter on revelation, faith and reason, so the second concludes with one on the problem of immanence and transcendence which brings the whole discussion to a head. In this de Burgh shows how this problem is the fundamental mystery confronting all human thinkers who do not evade the issue by stopping short of probing to the uttermost, and presents the Christian doctrines of creation and the incarnation as those wherein the philosopher's *fides* and *intellectus* meet in mutually satisfying harmony.

I find myself so much in agreement with this book, so much beholden to its author for his penetrating and lucid exposition of what I believe to be fundamental truths, that I can find little to say by way of review in general beyond expressing the hope that it may be widely read, pondered and discussed. I will content

myself, therefore, with drawing attention to a few points of special interest, and one of genuine disagreement.

To take this last first. At least twice (on pp. 194 and 198) de Burgh associates himself with certain neo-thomists who give existence a primacy over essence. This seems to me to be inconsistent with the thomist affirmation of the identity of essence and existence in God. Surely in that identity neither can be before or after the other, but both must be co-equal. The point is important because in some quarters a pseudo-solution of the problem of evil has been built on the supposed priority of existence.

Turning to instances of de Burgh's power to illuminate dark corners of thought, I would mention first the passage on p. 135 where he points to man's appreciation of aesthetic excellence, his acts of love, and his assent to truth as analogous foretastes of the perfect freedom of *non posse peccare*. Again, his reconciliation of the Kantian "ought implies can" with the saying about unprofitable servants in St. Luke xvii, 10, is worthy of note: "He wills, in each concrete instance, to do 'duty universal', and, at the end of a long life of faithful service, 'duty universal' far transcends the furthest scope of his achievement. 'Still leagues beyond these leagues there is more sea'" (p. 158). This is well said; but to take it as the whole truth of the matter would dissolve away the central paradox of the Christian life, the reality both of obligation and of man's need of divine grace. Once more, the passage on rules of conduct as distinguished from principles deserves to be quoted:

"General rules of moral conduct are inductions from moral experience, expressing the sort of actions that have been found obligatory in the past. These *prima facie* duties, as Sir David Ross has called them, are most important as guide-posts in the deliberate process that precedes the clear recognition of our duty, and a man will neglect them at his peril. But they are never absolute, without exception; though in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred it may be a man's duty to keep his promise or to speak the truth, it may also in the hundredth case be his duty to break his promise, or to lie" (p. 164).

Lastly, there is a passage on p. 200 which provokes thought about the nature of history:

"Neither science nor history can adequately account for the manifestations of divine activity within the temporal process. Only the effects, as temporal happenings, fall within the purview of those enquiries; the causes are supernatural and lie beyond. The methods of science and history are restricted to the explanation of events and

actions by their antecedents, to the operation of what are known to the theologians as secondary causes."

In these days it is customary among historians to distinguish between the genuine historian and the mere chronicler or annalist. The historian, it is said, does not only seek to establish the facts, but to estimate their relative importance and to interpret them. If, then, a Christian student of history, reading the evidence in the light of his faith, sees and expounds a meaning in the events as acts of God, does his faith, by the insight it gives him, make him a better historian? Or does it make him, at a certain point, cease to be an historian and become something else? To ask this question is to realize our loss in that we cannot now go and discuss it with Professor de Burgh.

LEONARD HODGSON.

RECOVERY OF MAN. By F. R. BARRY. (Nisbet). 8s. 6d.

THE line of thought followed in the Bishop of Southwell's recent book, which might be labelled "Liberal Personalism", represents an important stream in present-day English Protestant thinking, which we should try to see in its context.

His protest against the "denigration of man" by those elements in the Church who gloat over "the so-called Bankruptcy of Humanism" is timely. "If Humanism is indeed bankrupt", he writes, "then it is a disaster for the Church". "Moreover, we need a rebirth of Rationality" if we are to get general respect for worthy standards in our common life. He notes that on reason is based among other things Jurisprudence, a vital element in Western culture; this cultural significance of Law is a matter on which the universities and schools of this country—compared with most others—have been remarkably blind.

Even more important is his plea for an enlargement of our conception of reason or thought. "It is I who think, not my reason as a separable faculty of the mind. Thought engages the whole personality." Bare avoidance of self-contradiction does not produce fruitful thought; this latter involves, I believe, three other factors: Faith in the intelligibility of the subject-matter, Imagination to set oneself the questions and propose the hypotheses, and moral Responsibility to care about getting a right, even if disconcerting, answer. After an era of rather arid scientific rationalism and equally arid religious dogmatism, we are coming to recognize these facts (e.g., K. Popper's *Open Society* is a good example of this enlarged rationalism).

The bishop well emphasizes the vital importance of poetry to religion, for they both seem to involve the same power to apprehend symbolically, rather than verbally and schematically; and this power can become atrophied from disuse, as in the often quoted case of Charles Darwin. He recommends the widespread reading of Plato, Sophocles and Virgil; but I doubt whether these can play quite the part he expects in the revival of a living, integral culture. It is true they did play a great part in what we call "the" Renaissance, but it was rather in giving a new direction to a culture that was very much alive. Man's sense of joy, pity, wonder and terror, and his natural urge to express his sense of life in handicraft and festival, drama and philosophy, were unimpaired. Culture results when man does something from pure enjoyment, making some common utensil of an "unnecessarily" beautiful shape, engaging in "unnecessary" inquiries and adopting "unnecessarily" polite forms. It is impaired, as Bertrand Russell has well said, by our inordinate concentration on the *next* thing to be done instead of on what we are now doing—this usually in order to secure ourselves and others against all possible changes and inequalities of fortune.

The bishop demands that "the Church should devote far more attention to environmental conditions". I suspect these words. If they mean getting a more lively understanding of the troubles of our fellows, it is well. But life is not an arranging of "environmental conditions". I suspect Jesus would have condemned concentration on building ever-greater barns, even if the barns are all communal barns. "We deceive ourselves if we think to achieve security by any organization in this world", the bishop tells us in his last chapter. But I am not sure that this last chapter, on Apocalypticism, is quite satisfactorily integrated with the rest of the book; it reads like an afterthought. To maintain, as the bishop clearly does, that the Church should engage in politics, supporting some forms of government and combating others, while at the same time maintaining that all this activity can never really succeed in achieving its ends requires further elucidation. Apocalypticism is an affront to liberal humanism.

In general, the book gives the impression of being well-balanced, judicious and full of good observations (e.g., that the sense of sin is a relatively advanced religious experience). It will no doubt be attacked by the Barthian anti-humanists; I would like to criticize its central theses from another angle—very roughly, that of Aldous Huxley's *Perennial Philosophy*, which the bishop naturally dislikes, but which represents a point of view which the Church will have to reckon with.

First, I think over-emphasis of the "personality" of God is harmful and one of the chief reasons leading to the discredit of religion. On the whole, the teaching of the early Church was that God was not a Person, but personality was in God. This is intelligible to the modern man; to be told that God is just another Person alongside of himself and the rest of nature is not. In Jesus' saying "God is Spirit", we might remember that the word with all its many overtones does literally mean "Breath". It is more natural for modern man to conceive God under the "impersonal" modes of "life-force", "inward light", "apex of the soul", etc.—even though these conceptions are only half the truth and though he must also be conceived as personified.

I think the liberal cult of personality in the sense of emphasizing the separateness of the individual and his individual rights is also practically harmful. I am not so pessimistic as the bishop about the present state of our culture; the B.B.C. alone is evidence of much good which remains to us. But Western society has been atomized to a degree never known before; men are sick of being preached to about their dignity as individuals, and want friendship and community. Let the Church bring men to the point of gladly waiving their individual rights even to the extent they did in the bombed cities in the war, and both religion and culture might be reborn. Incidentally, the trend of modern psychological research (summarized, e.g., by Professor Price in the January *Hibbert Journal*) is slowly but surely undermining our conception of the separateness of personality. The greatest personalities in history felt themselves not as dignified individuals but as vehicles of super-personal forces.

Finally, I think that the limited and parochial outlook of the Protestant State Churches, from which this book is not free, has done both religion and culture great harm. The bishop says, "The State exists to safeguard religion", evidently meaning his particular form of it. He gives no inkling of the fact that there are other living religions that have produced a high culture; and when he speaks of Christianity, it is evident that he ignores the main stream of Christianity—the Roman Catholic—and one big side-stream—the Greek Orthodox—whose views on this matter of individual rights are importantly different. He says: "it is one of the tragic ironies of history" that Western civilization should so soon again be in danger. Tragic, indeed, but the law of cosmic justice is tragic; the Western nations recklessly started a European war and pushed it to all lengths to get the complete subjection of their enemies; how can this come to good? The leaders of the Western State Churches, with few exceptions, iden-

tified themselves enthusiastically with the interests of their states, and this book shows them preparing to do so again, only this time Stalin is cast for the "man of sin" in place of the Kaiser and Hitler. God is a God of justice and of compassion, but he does not care whether we are ruled from London or Moscow, whether we have votes or not, or whether we keep our property. This is figurative language, of course, but I am confident that it means something; it is, however, a hard saying for bishops, as it was for the high priests of Jeremiah's and Jesus' times. Modern man is accustomed to astronomical spaces and aeons, and will not be content with so parochial a god.

CLAUD SUTTON.

HOW CAME OUR FAITH. By W. A. L. ELMSLIE. (Cambridge University Press.) 21s. Pp. xii and 417.

ONE of the features of British scholarship during the last twenty years has been the revival of Old Testament Studies, and the freshness and vitality of Dr. Elmslie bears testimony to its strength and vitality. It is intended for those who want more than 5s. worth of Old Testament generalizations but are not equipped to deal with more technical studies. It is based upon a long period of teaching and lecturing in the university and represents the matured results of such oral transmission of basic ideas to other living minds. The title, not perhaps an altogether felicitous one, is the product of filial piety, and we seem to be promised a second volume on the later period which will do more to justify its use than the first.

The author's aim is to offer a vindication of the relevance and organic relationship of the Old Testament to the Christian Faith and with many pungent and sometimes even humorous comments to illustrate the application of the Old Testament to modern times and contemporary problems. Many of these *obiter dicta* not only form an integral part of his purpose in writing, but also give considerable food for thought.

It is not Dr. Elmslie's primary task to keep his readers abreast of the latest hypotheses in the field of Old Testament scholarship, but in footnote discussions as well as in the interpretations offered in the text, he shows that he is as familiar with more recent studies as with the standard older scholarship of pioneers like W. Robertson Smith, George Adam Smith and A. B. Davidson. The combination of old and new authorities is an excellent feature in the book. On questions like the date of the Exodus and the pre-Mosaic origins of the name Jahweh he represents

the recent swing back of scholarship to the views advanced in C. F. Burney's *Book of Judges*. Budde's theory of the Kenite origin of Jahvism is relegated to a footnote, and he notes the principal weaknesses in Garstang's dating of the fall of Jericho and the implications which at one period seemed to flow inexorably from it.

His treatment of Moses and Samuel will be rather too imaginative for some minds. It is perhaps inevitable that he should appeal to imagination where the facts are so scanty and he always aims at controlling his imaginative conclusions by such facts as are available. It is a defect in his treatment of Elijah that he does not seem to make any distinction between the conflicts with the Syrian Baal on Mount Carmel and with the Canaanite Baalim (givers of corn and wine and oil) in the drought and rain-making episodes. While selection is obviously necessitated by the scope of the book, some treatment of Micaiah-ben-Imlah, that often unrecognized precursor of Amos, would have been welcome. His dismissal of the Scythian menace as throwing any light upon the prophecies of Jeremiah, in line with some recent American criticism, will well repay careful consideration.

I am in greatest disagreement with Dr. Elmslie on his treatment of the attitude of the eighth- and seventh-century prophets to the cultus. The old antithesis between priest and prophet has been largely broken down by such scholars as Haldar and Aubrey Johnson, and on the question of Exegesis, the short article by Fr. Lattey on the use of the relative negative in the prophets is worthy of careful attention. Perhaps Jeremiah alone stands wholly apart from the cultus of his day.

Nor should his adoption of Dr. Torrey's theory of the dating and purpose of Second-Isaiah command acceptance. Dr. Smith's recent Schweich Lectures, while perhaps not reliable in every detail of its exegetical application, has gone far to vindicate the essentially *exilic* character of Isaiah xl-xlv, nor does Dr. Elmslie's rather flippant quotation of a possible Hitlerian parody of "Hail to the Lord's anointed" suffice to dismiss the possibility that the servant of Jahweh may be, in Second Isaiah, (apart from the Servant Songs) Cyrus, King of Persia. Does not Jeremiah allude to Nebuchadnezzar as the Servant of Jahweh?

It might well have been better to conclude the book strictly at the Exile, reserving all subsequent Hebrew religion and literature for the second volume. It is strange to be offered (though I suspect a further adhesion to Dr. Torrey's theories to be the cause) some treatment of Second Isaiah but none of Ezekiel.

But such disagreements on admittedly difficult issues of

scholarship detract only slightly from the value of the book. It is the product of careful study and vigorous thought. The author has a wide range of interests outside the field of his special study and never descends into mere Old Testament antiquarianism for its own sake. A vital mind, a wide outlook, a deep spiritual insight are all brought to bear upon his subject, and the best compliment we can pay Dr. Elmslie is to wish for a second volume on the later period from his pen with all possible speed, to light up the darker places of post-exilic Judaism and to point out the *praeparatio evangelica* in the Persian, Greek and Maccabean periods where the modern reader has no "open vision" and even the professional scholar gropes about seeking someone to lead him by the hand.

H. E. W. TURNER.

EYES OF FAITH: A Study in the Biblical Point of View. By P. S. MINEAR. (Lutterworth Press). 15s.

DR. Paul Sevier Minear is Norris Professor of New Testament Interpretation at the Andover Newton Theological School, Massachusetts. He is known in America for a number of contributions to theological journals, and *Eyes of Faith* was received with a good deal of enthusiasm when it was published there in 1946. The Lutterworth Press have performed a valuable service in making it available in this country, since it marks out Dr. Minear as a writer whose subsequent work we shall look for with interest.

The book poses a genuine problem and gives some valuable insights in the attempt to answer it; and while the answer cannot be judged entirely satisfactory, the attempt was well worth making. The problem is roughly as follows: the thought of the western world has been formed partly by biblical ways of thinking, and partly by the philosophical and scientific tradition; the latter now predominate to such an extent that it is no longer possible to read the Bible through western spectacles with any degree of accuracy. The study of the Bible in the last hundred years has been mainly concerned with linguistic, textual, literary and historical problems; and while there is now a clearly marked movement in the direction of a Biblical theology, it is still a movement which cannot extricate itself entirely from the philosophical elements which have influenced Western theological thought in general. The elusive Hebrew idea of corporate personality is an example which immediately comes to mind of a biblical idea which cannot be adequately expressed in terms of the ontology and psychology which have prevailed in the West;

while the Hebrew-Christian consciousness and understanding of time and eternity in relation to history and destiny have never entirely freed themselves from their Greek interpretations, just as the Greek idea of the immortality of the soul has tended to be more readily acceptable than the Jewish idea of the resurrection of the body.

It is to this problem that Dr. Minear addresses himself in his "study of the biblical point of view"; and he enumerates five features of it which have impressed him: "(1) the strangeness of the Biblical perspective; (2) the unity of this perspective throughout the Biblical period; (3) the futility of trying to understand any segment of thought detached from its hidden context; (4) the germinal power and universal relevance that emerges whenever that context is uncovered and appropriated; (5) the unsuspected value of the more objectionable patterns of thought in locating distinctive dimensions." Accordingly, in trying to define this perspective, he divides his book into four parts: the first part is concerned with the single angle of vision, and discusses the divine visitation and election, the creation of a people and the appointment of times, the necessity of human decision and the fact of rebellion; the second part is concerned with the character of the event in the foreground on which the biblical writers focus their attention (the concealment and revelation of the divine word, the signs and parables of prophecy); the third part deals with the horizons of history, and the peculiar interaction of forgetfulness and remembrance, despair and hope, which leads the prophets to look beyond history; while the fourth part attempts to assess the revision of this point of view which is occasioned by the coming of the Messiah, and which impels the Christian faith to seek new horizons.

Such a summary gives no indication of the value of Dr. Minear's discussion of these individual topics, which is inevitably uneven; but it does fairly represent the scope of the book as a whole, and it is as a whole that it should be judged. "We have engaged," he says, "in elucidating the inner structure of human existence as apprehended by prophets" and "the ultimate issues which are involved *for man* in his encounter with God." And so it very soon becomes clear that "the biblical point of view" is very largely equated with the existentialism typified by Soren Kierkegaard and religious thinkers who have been influenced by him. Now it cannot be denied that Kierkegaard in his turn had been profoundly influenced by the Bible, and his attack on the Hegelian "System" would be interpreted by some people as proof that he had no room for metaphysics. Nor can it be denied that the biblical point of view could be legitimately described as

"existentialist," just as it cannot be denied that Thomism is a philosophy of existence. So even allowing for variations in meaning of the term *existence* and its derivatives, such an equation is not altogether satisfactory. It is not made deliberately and consciously, of course; but the number of occasions on which Kierkegaard and his followers are used by quotation to substantiate the argument would suggest that it is there implicitly.

There are two more points which should be made in reviewing this book. The first is that the biblical point of view tends to be equated with the prophetic point of view. The present reviewer must confess that he found Dr. Minear's discussion of this topic, and the biblical interpretation of history and eschatology connected with it, extremely valuable. But it must also be pointed out that law, sacrifice and wisdom, have to be taken into account as well as prophecy if we are going to understand the biblical point of view in its wholeness. Secondly, while the biblical standpoint is existential, the speculative issues which it raises cannot be ignored. The theologian, and particularly the biblical theologian, as Tillich says, "is bound to the concrete and existential situation in which he finds himself and which is not only the basis but also the subject of his work." But "philosophy, although knowing the existential presuppositions of truth, does not abide with them. It turns immediately to the content and tries to grasp it directly."

With these reservations, we should like to commend Dr. Minear's book most warmly. It has a freshness and vigour in thought and expression which, even though it may strike English ears as rather rough at times, serves to drive home its message. It makes a real effort to grapple with the problem that has been raised, and the help and illumination gained in such a struggle is probably more fruitful than a neatly-rounded solution which claims to be the last word.

R. H. DAUBNEY.

THE ENGLISH SECULAR CATHEDRALS IN THE MIDDLE AGES. By KATHLEEN EDWARDS, M.A., PH.D. (Manchester University Press.) 25s. net.

THE publication of church records, and particularly of episcopal registers by the Canterbury and York Society, has almost revolutionized the study of the daily working of the medieval Church in England. The notable contributions to our understanding of this made by Professors Jacob, Cheney, Barraclough, Knowles, Hamilton Thompson and by Dr. Rose Graham and Dr. Churchill

(to mention but a few) have been possible in part because of these publications. "History cannot be written from manuscripts" is a truth sometimes overlooked by historians who could scarcely have done their work but for the fact that texts printed, indexed and introduced, available for relatively convenient consultation in the larger libraries, have been at their disposal. At the same time, no one has written valuably on the history of Church or State who has not laboured with charters, rolls and parchment, getting behind the ubiquitous print which can sometimes be so misleading.

Dr. Kathleen Edwards has grasped the truth of these generalizations. She has used manuscript sources at Salisbury, Lincoln, Oxford and the British Museum, and she has relied on the work of others at York, Lambeth, Cambridge and Exeter. She has also limited her immediate field of study to the "secular" (i.e., non-monastic) cathedrals of Lincoln, Salisbury, Wells, York, London, Chichester, Hereford, Exeter and Lichfield, and, with appropriate divagations, to the fourteenth century. She thus set herself a manageable task, and she has completed it well. It can be said at once that we now have a really valuable reference book which is also descriptive and readable. A piece of work that badly needed doing has been most satisfactorily completed.

An important issue is stated at the outset and, in a sense, runs through the book. To what extent were the cathedral canons residentiaries? It is well known that the canons, holding separate prebends, were not necessarily bound to reside, having no cure of souls and being able to provide deputies. They were, for the most part, wealthy and distinguished men, often employed by Kings, Popes and bishops on important business in Church and State. Without the money supplied by the prebends, neither the *curia* at Rome, nor the civil service at home, could have obtained trained administrators so cheaply. Miss Edwards returns more than once to this point and is perhaps a little too emphatic about it. Not all the non-residents were thus employed, and she hardly alludes to the minority for whom the possession of a prebend, even if assigned for purposes of scholarship, became an opportunity for idleness and extravagance in the capital or a university town. In this matter more biographical investigation may prove helpful.

There was always a certain number of residents, including the four great officers—dean, precentor, chancellor and treasurer—with other officers such as the subdean, succentor, archdeacons and grammar school master who might, or might not, be members of the Chapter. For these, and others, there were

positive encouragements to reside—houses, distribution of food and drink, additional, and sometimes almost exclusive, claims upon dividends from the common funds. Thus a distinction came to be drawn between the greater residentiaries, the lesser residentiaries, and the non-resident canons, the former conducting most of the business of the Chapter, spiritual and secular, accepting responsibility for the conduct of the cathedral services and dispensing hospitality (which meant the provision of fairly well defined board and lodging in their houses for particular people, especially the vicars choral).

The section dealing with the bishop in his cathedral church is valuable chiefly as a clear compilation. What is said is unexceptionable but has been stated before equally well. We are enabled to understand, once again, why it was that bishops seldom agreed with deans and chapters and why the "secular" bishops usually lived some distance away from their cathedral city. Continental analogies here, particularly from Liège, could have been added as additional illustrative and explanatory matter.

There is a fair amount of information, sometimes a little repetitive, about the contribution of the cathedral clergy to medieval education, together with some very valuable observations about the finances of the common fund and the fabric fund. Most readers, however, will find the greatest interest to lie in the last chapter of the book, dealing with the lesser clergy, the vicars choral, the minor canons, the chantry chaplains, the choristers and those patient probationaries known as poor clerks, or altarists, or clerks of the second form. Like others, they, too, were organized and institutionalized, and Miss Edwards deals faithfully with them and provides a valuable glimpse of the collegiate life that they lived. She is always generous, usually accurate and enthusiastically determined to give the benefit of the doubt to those who cannot answer for themselves. For many readers she has undoubtedly answered many questions, and her book will be widely read and with profit.

GEORGE RICHARD POTTER.

THOMAS TENISON, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY, HIS LIFE AND TIMES. By EDWARD CARPENTER. (S.P.C.K., for the Church Historical Society). pp. ix + 446. 30s.

TENISON, appointed to Canterbury in 1695, was second in the succession of Whig primates, which began at the Revolution. Evelyn thought him admirable, Swift described him as very dull,

and Hearne stigmatized him as "one of the most virulent enemies of the Church of England and the Universities". There is now at last, in this new Life by Dr. Edward Carpenter, a modern full-scale biography, which is authoritatively founded on a wide range of sources, in print and in manuscript. Dr. Carpenter was, however, refused access to the records in the London diocesan registry.

Tenison's father and an uncle, both country parsons, had suffered deprivation during the interregnum. Tenison himself (in 1683) condemned the execution of Charles I as an "execrable Murther". Yet for all this, he was not of the school of Sancroft and Ken. At Cambridge he fell under the influence of Cudworth, and though a member of both universities, was a Cambridge latitudinarian, not an Oxford patristic. Moreover, his great prominence coincided roughly with the period in which the issue was a dominating one, of a Roman Catholic or a Protestant succession in the monarchy. At the time of the exclusion Bill, in 1680, he became Vicar of St. Martin-in-the-Fields. In 1689, Henry Compton made him Archdeacon of London. In 1692, as one of the ten clerics who had been recommended to William III by Burnet as safe to be preferred, he was made Bishop of Lincoln, from which see he was translated after three years to the primacy. He died in December, 1715.

Tenison's incumbency at St. Martin's was remarkable. He secured in 1685 the division of the parish, by the forming of St. James's, Piccadilly. In 1687 St. Thomas, Regent Street, was built, as a private chapel-of-ease, in Swallow Street. In 1689 the wooden building which had been used for the Roman mass in King James's army at Hounslow Heath was set up in Conduit Street for prayer-book services. All this was necessary, because London was spreading northwards. At St. Martin's there was a full round of services. Out of his own funds, Tenison founded the St. Martin's Library, amongst other things to draw away the numerous divines in his parish, mostly chaplains to noblemen, from gossip in the coffee-houses. Inspired no doubt by the Jesuits' charity school at the Savoy, Tenison founded the St. Martin's charity grammar school, still existing under his name at Kennington. The pupils were, of course, to learn "the Principles of Church Religion". Above all, Tenison made St. Martin's what Dr. Carpenter calls "a rallying ground for the protestant national spirit". Tenison was indefatigable as a protestant controversialist. His public debate in 1687 with the Jesuit Andrew Pulton made a great stir, but is now tedious reading, the arguments on both sides being erudite but unoriginal.

In Dr. Carpenter's words, "Tenison's fear of the Catholics proved to be a life-long passion". This passion was more intense, perhaps, than reasonable. In 1708 he urged Wake, Bishop of Lincoln, to prosecute a Dr. Bernard of that diocese, who had produced *An Exact and Critical Account . . . how far the Book of Common Prayer is taken out of the Offices of the Church of Rome*. It would be interesting to know whether Tenison's zeal here led him to be unjust. Did "Popish Bernard" go farther towards "popery", so to speak, than such a book as Sparrow's *Rationale*? (His *Account* seems unfortunately so rare as not to be in the British Museum library.) Was Dr. Bernard one of those many clerics of whom Tenison disapproved, because they held "Popish Tenets under the notion of the doctrines and practices of the primitive Church"?

Tenison was active both at the Revolution, and on behalf of the Hanoverian succession. As a leader of the London clergy, and a known Whig, he was busy in 1688 in the comings and goings that led to the refusals to read James II's second declaration of indulgence. He was soon made privy to the invitation to William of Orange. He was an enthusiastic member of the comprehension commission of 1689, of whose proceedings this book contains a most useful account. Dr. Carpenter is particularly interesting also about the archbishop's part in the Whig counsels before 1714. Tenison used his influence in 1705, in a correspondence quoted in this book, to prevent the Electress Sophia from embarrassing the Whig friends of Hanover by seeking an invitation to London. When this had failed, and the rejection of the idea had led to strained relations between the two courts, he laboured in the important task of restoring harmony.

This book amply illustrates the extraordinary interaction at this time of Church politics with those of the succession. Dr. Carpenter takes a whiggish view of the Revolution, as achieved without bloodshed, "although perhaps at the expense of a few uneasy consciences among the clergy". One may doubt whether there is any "perhaps" about it. As Bishop Henson remarked, the Revolution affected the episcopate in two ways, at once binding them closely to the protestant succession, and separating them in sympathy from the body of the clergy, amongst whom Jacobite sentiments (if no more) remained strong. But for this, would the Convocation disputes have been so bitter? It was against the Whig bishops, as Dr. Carpenter says, that the truculent Atterbury led the lower clergy. These disputes "marched in step with the pace of political events". Toryism in Whitehall meant independent action in the Lower House.

Political considerations seem at times to have deflected Tenison as archbishop from strict justice. The Tory Watson,

Bishop of St. David's, was deprived by the archbishop, and died excommunicate. Yet on the most serious charge, that of simony, he was not allowed to call a witness vital to his defence. He maintained his innocence to the last. The Whig bishop Jones, on the other hand, of St. Asaph, plainly a corrupt character, who could not but admit his enormities, got off with a light suspension. Dr. Carpenter, after a full and most judicious survey, concludes that these judgements were essentially political. In Watson's case, Burnet perhaps made the bullets, which Tenison fired. Similar bias may be suspected in the archbishop's dealings with All Souls', discussed in another interesting chapter of this book.

With Whig ministers, Tenison, as a convinced Whig, worked happily, but after the accession of Anne, who preferred the Tory Archbishop of York, he was studiously ignored, as Secker was later in the century, when George III had brought in new advisers. But even under William III the path was not entirely smooth. Dr. Carpenter has some interesting pages on the working of the commission set up by William III in 1695 to make recommendation through the secretaries of State for the bestowal of Crown patronage. This came to an end apparently after Lord Jersey, a Tory secretary, had merely informed the commission that a Mr. Stapylton, his chaplain, had been nominated prebendary of Worcester. There was nothing to be done. Burnet was furious, Patrick cynical, and Tenison helpless. "Preferment", as Dr. Carpenter remarks, "was too valuable a royal asset for it to be controlled even by those who were, in fact, the King's best friends".

Tenison, at least in the earlier years of his episcopal life, before court neglect had pushed him into the background, carried on the reforming zeal of the Vicar of St. Martin's. In discussing these activities, Dr. Carpenter gives us some fascinating miniatures of contemporary Church life. Tenison made war on clerical ignorance, and on non-residence beyond the strict limits of the Canon of 1603. In 1712 he secured the withdrawal of a dispensation which had been given by royal authority for the holding in plurality of two livings more than the canonical thirty miles apart—"a very wicked thing", he said. Dr. Carpenter quotes from the Lambeth MSS. an interesting opinion of Stillingfleet's, that the archbishop might refuse a dispensation to a man legally qualified, but must be prepared to answer for it, should a case be brought in Chancery before the Lord Keeper. Tenison served most faithfully as president of the S.P.G., urged the necessity of a bishop for the plantations, and when the Queen died was some way towards getting a bishop for Virginia. He used his

influence also to get some relief for the "piscies" of Scotland.

Tenison was, it is true, a latitudinarian, but not of the type of Hoadly (being anything but a heresiarch), and more moderate than Burnet. Although he had been enthusiastic for a "comprehension" of the dissenters in 1689, he was clear that latitude must have limits. "Presbyterians, Arians, Socinians, Anabaptists, Fifth-Monarchy men . . . Sweet Singers", he said, "might associate in a Caravan but could not joyn in the Communion of a Church". There is no reason to suppose that the argument was at all lost upon him "that it would be a doubtful blessing if certain alterations which encouraged some Dissenters to conform, provoked a number of Churchmen to secede". When suggestions came from Prussia which in some ways remarkably anticipated the Jerusalem bishopric of 1841, Tenison, for whatever reasons, was certainly not less wary than Howley, his Victorian successor. Above all he was stout for an Athanasian orthodoxy. He condemned the speculations of Whiston, and secured the putting down of a Dutch version of the Prayer-book which Arianized it. He was keen also for decency and order. The non-juror Brett not only praised his fatherly care as diocesan, but recorded of his confirmations that "nothing could be more solemn, Decent, and Regular".

Dr. Carpenter's book is a mine of good things, which include some interesting curiosities, such as the story of the man who sent for the Vicar of St. Martin's when dying "under the Horreur of having cut the King's Head" on January 30, 1649. There was also the letter sent to the archbishop in 1696, reporting that Charles I had recognized as one of his masked executioners the son of the Earl of Stamford, Grey of Groby. Dr. Carpenter's book would, however, be improved, in a technical way, if some few of the references were more precise. "S.P.G. minutes" is not enough, and needs a date. Citations of statutes are more usefully given in the form of "11 William III, c. 4", and of parliamentary papers in the style suggested by Professor Bellot in the *Bulletin* of the Institute of Historical Research, XI (1933-4), pp. 97-98. The 1854 publication of the 1689 Prayer-book proposals is better indicated on page 101 than in the bibliography, on p. 450. There is, finally, Dr. Carpenter's use of the word "Catholic". Unlike Tenison himself (so far as I have checked him), unlike the statutes of the realm and the Book of Common Prayer, Dr. Carpenter generally uses "Catholic" as equivalent to "Roman Catholic", which seems odd in a work of exact learning, published under the auspices of the S.P.C.K., and written by an English parochial incumbent. These are, however, but minor blemishes (though not wholly

negligible) in an important contribution to historical knowledge. This book is a valuable successor to *Thomas Sherlock*. We look forward to seeing in it the predecessor of a yet finer *Henry Compton*.

R. W. GREAVES.

YOUNG MR. NEWMAN. By MAISIE WARD. (Sheed and Ward.)
21s.

MAISIE Ward, who is Mrs. Sheed, and the daughter of Wilfred Ward, the best-known biographer of Newman, has taken Dr. Routh's remark, "That clever young gentleman of Oriel, Mr. Newman", as a text for the most detailed account hitherto published of Newman's Anglican career. No figure in the religious world during the last century has attracted so many writers as Newman: within the last few years, partly owing to the drift towards authoritative religion following two wars, and more particularly owing to the forthcoming canonization of Father Dominic Barberi, the stream of books has become a spate, and it has become difficult to disentangle the good from the bad in them. But comparatively little has been written about Newman's career in the Anglican Church: her father, as Maisie Ward explains, only gave 75 pages out of two large volumes to the first 44 years of Newman's life; and much of the material he might have used has never been published. For the 1,400 pages of letters already printed (but now out of print) were not given in full; and since Anne Mozley went through them with Newman himself in 1885 no one has used the files of unpublished letters which are still at the Oratory at Birmingham; there are other letters in the possession of the Mozley family; and a number of volumes of letters, verses, diaries, and other papers collected and labelled by Newman himself "Autobiographical Remains".

For Newman took a "profound interest in his own past", and spent many hours arranging, selecting, and copying records of his childhood; not as one who regretted his unregenerate youth, but as one who would trace all through it the "Kindly Light" which had led him on, till once more he could see the "angel faces" of the country childhood at Ham, and find his way back to his spiritual home. It is to trace this journey that Maisie Ward has thought it worth while to recover and piece together the details of Newman's family life, which was always in the background of his experiences, his school-days, his undergraduate years at Trinity, and the better known time at Oriel, St. Mary's,

and Littlemore. As the story becomes more familiar there is less that Mrs. Sheed can contribute: but no one can miss the main (if unconscious) conclusion of her book—that Newman's character remained the same before and after the change of faith which divides his career into two otherwise inconsistent parts.

Newman's earliest memory was, at the age of 4½, lying in bed "with candles in the windows in illumination for the victory at Trafalgar". He remained very much an English patriot and aristocrat all his life; hating Liberalism; having little sympathy with the working classes; and refusing even to enter the streets in Paris when accident left him there for 24 hours during the revolution of 1830. An unusually clever boy, he could read at five, started Greek at nine, kept a Latin diary, and soon went to the head of his school at Ealing (it was by mere chance that he did not go to Winchester, as it was later on that he went to Oxford instead of Cambridge). He did not care for games, but enjoyed bathing, acting, and reciting, founded a school society, edited two school papers, and became a skilled violin player. The religion of his home was Low Church, but not Calvinistic. At 15 he experienced a "conversion" which confirmed him in his evangelical views, and was associated with the dislike of Roman Catholicism that lasted up to the eve of his secession; his youthful diaries are full of religious searchings of heart, and some Latin prayers that recall those of Dr. Johnson.

But at Oxford he found himself at the two most "gentleman-like" colleges, Trinity and Oriel; and though he was not unhappy—no one ever appreciated more deeply the beauty of its buildings and scenery—he remained silent and largely disapproving. It needed the eccentric Whateley to "bring him out of his shell" at Oriel; he was addicted to solitary walks, and his silences in Common Room were notorious. All his eloquence was in his pen: he wrote continually; as though he could not think except on paper. The turning-points in his religious process had always been the personal influences. As his Calvinistic "conversion" at school had been due to Mayers, so at Oriel it was through Whateley, Lloyd, Froude, Blanco White, Pusey, Keble, that he became a High Anglican, and caught the ideas that were to inspire the Oxford Movement. It has been put forward as a thesis by the Abbé Brémond that Newman was no more than the weathercock of these successive influences. But this Mrs. Sheed very properly denies. His mind was pliable, but his temperament, his essential character, never changed. He could command the devotion of his friends and followers precisely because he was so self-centred. He could be a Calvinist, an Anglican, and a Catholic

with equal fervour because the only issue throughout lay between himself and his Maker, who was as real to him as himself. The only thing that mattered to him or to anyone else was the salvation of the soul. Here, perhaps, his biographer does not quite understand him. She writes as though his conversion were a gradual intellectual conviction: but this was rather the effect than the cause of Newman's inner development. True, every step of his spiritual progress was marked by a book: but few serious thinkers have been convinced by his reasoning: hundreds have been swayed by his personal faith and charm. And these were essentially the same throughout his life.

It is possible to mark down the incidents which led, step by step, to Newman's secession: his "conversion" at 15: his doubt about baptismal regeneration when a curate at St. Clement's: his friendship with Froude: the Peel election in 1828: his breach with the C.M.S. and work on Arianism the next year: his visit to Rome and conversation with Wiseman (of which perhaps Mrs. Sheed makes too little) in '32: his illness in Sicily the same year: the Hampden controversy: Wiseman's article in the *Dublin Review*, and a number of other events in '36, which he himself instances, and describes as "a new scene gradually opened": and finally Ward's *Ideal of a Christian Church*. "Newman's genius", writes Mrs. Sheed, "found its scope in a unique vocation—at once spiritual and intellectual—of drawing the world nearer to God not by prayer but by thought. His was perhaps the greatest theological vocation since St. Thomas" (p. 228). Perhaps he "lived and moved more among the early Fathers than among his living friends": but one cannot forget his practical ability as a college tutor and bursar, his enthusiastic campaign for the political defeat of Peel, or his shrewd advice to such hot-headed "Romanizers" as Ambrose Phillips. There was plenty of hardness behind his almost feminine sensitivity; plenty of common sense behind his enthusiasm; plenty of self-confidence behind his apparent yielding to the influence of a book or a friend. *Credo in Newmanum* would never have become a creed if his followers' faith in him had depended on his books. James Mozley, whose mind was not merely, as Mrs. Sheed says, "the best in the Movement next to Newman's", but the best of them all, was never convinced. Pusey, who knew the Fathers even better than he did, refused to accept his conclusions. To the Pusey family at Christ Church he was "a dark middle-aged, middle-sized man, with lanky black hair and large spectacles, thin, gentlemanly, and very insinuating", who told the children fairy stories. Routh, to whom he dedicated his *Via Media*, thought him a "clever young man", no more. Sympathy,

imagination, spiritual insight—yes, and expressed with an eloquence almost unmatched in English literature: but not logical reasoning.

But reasoning never “saved souls”; and if that is the issue in religion, if the urgency that is felt to belong to it attaches to man’s everlasting destiny in another life; then one turns not to the *Essay on Development*, but to the *Dream of Gerontius*, to Newman the poet, not to Newman the theologian.

J. M. THOMPSON.

PERIODICALS

The Journal of Religion (Vol. XXIX. No. 1. January, 1949. University of Chicago Press). S. J. Case: The Historical Study of Religion. C. C. McCown: Shirley Jackson Case's Contribution to the Theory of Socio-historical Interpretation. P. Schubert: Shirley Jackson Case, Historian of Early Christianity, an Appraisal. L. B. Jennings: Bibliography of the Writings of Shirley Jackson Case. A. N. Wilder: Dodd, *The Johannine Epistles*; Cullmann, *Le Baptême des Enfants et la Doctrine biblique du Baptême*. A. Wikgren: Knox, *The Acts of the Apostles*. O. A. Piper: Beare, *I Peter*. R. Marcus: *Coniectanea Neotestamentica*, XI; Rosenblatt: Saadia Gaon's Book of Beliefs and Opinions. J. A. Bewer: Seierstad, *Die Offenbarungerlebisse der Propheten Amos, Jesaja u. Jeremia*. E. M. Carlson: Normann, *Prästorskapel och Karolinska enväldet*; Kroon, *Det svenska prästmötet under medeltiden*. P. Lehmann: McNeill, *Books of Faith and Power*. S. E. Meed: Persons, *Free Religion*. J. H. Nichols: Zabriskie, *Bishop Brent*. W. W. Sweet: Harmon, *The Organization of the Methodist Church*. C. D. Kean: Tillich, *The Protestant Era*. S. C. Kinchelve: Kinsey, *Sexual Behaviour*. D. C. Shipley: Hardman, *The Christian Doctrine of Grace*. D. D. Williams: Ferré, *Evil and the Christian Faith*. J. Wild: Rutenber, *The Doctrine of the Imitation of God in Plato*. M. M. Berman: Agus, *Rabbi Meir of Rothenberg* (†1293). W. S. Hudson: Underwood, *History of the English Baptists*.

Bibliotheca Sacra (Vol. 105. No. 420. Vol. 106. No. 421. October, 1948-March, 1949. Dallas, Texas: Dallas Theological Seminary). L. S. Chafer: The Riches of Divine Grace, II (III. No. 421). J. F. Walvoord: Christological Typology, II (III. No. 421). M. F. Unger: The Temple Vision of Ezekiel, I (II. No. 421). E. F. Harrison: The Son of God among the Sons of Men, XV (XVI. No. 421). P. Stiensens: Church Reform in the Late Middle Ages, II (III. No. 421). C. L. Feinberg: The Uses of the Psalter, II. E. E. Cairns: The Theology of *Paradise Lost*, I (II. No. 421). W. W. Orr: The Most Important Thing in Life, II. A. A. Berle: Tillich, *The Shaking of the Foundations* (critical). E. E. Cairns: Toynbee, *Civilization on Trial* (4 pp.). No. 421. J. F. Walvoord: The Millennial Issue in Modern Theology. W. M. Anderson: Perplexed, but not in Despair. M. B. Stearns: Zankow, *Die Orthodoxe Kirche des Ostens in Oekumenischer Sicht*; Guggisberg, *Die Römisch-katholische Kirche*. Farmer, *Huldrych Zwingli*, II. ("a priceless source of information").

Theological Studies (Vol. IX. No. 4. December, 1948. Baltimore 2, Md.: Mt. Royal and Guilford Avenues) J. C. Murray, S.J.: St. Robert Bellarmine on the Indirect Power. D. J. Saunders, S.J.: The Devil and the Divinity of Christ. P. J. Donnelly, S.J.: A Recent Critique of P. de Lubac's *Surnaturel*. G. Weigel, S.J.: Theology in S. America. J. C. Pluraeus: Some Little-known Early Witnesses to Mary's *Virginitas in Partu* [Irenaeus *Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching*, c. 54; *Protevangelium Jacobi*, cc. 18-20; *Visio Isaiae*, II; *Odes of Solomon*, 19. J. Danielou, S.J.: The Philosophy of Philo. The Significance of Prof. H. A. Wolfson's new Study (12 pp.). E. A. Ryan, S.J.: Catholics and the Peace of Westphalia. B. Altaner: St. Augustine's Preservation of his own Writings. J. Collins: Schrey, *Existenz u. Offenbarung*. C. H. Metzger: Leflon, *L'Eglise de France et la Révolution de 1848*. D. J. Saunders, S.J.: Richardson, *Christian Apologetics*; Schweitzer, *The Psychiatric Study of Jesus*.

The Scottish Journal of Theology (Vol. I. No. 3. Vol. II. No. 1. December, 1948, *March, 1949. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd). A. G. Hebert: The Bible in the Church. G. Johnston: The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament. W. Lillie: Missionary Communication. G. O. Griffith: Natural Theology and the Ministry of the Word. D. H. C. Read: Holy Materialism. An Examination of Lüthi's *Die Soziale Frage im Lichte der Bibel*. F. W. Canfield: The Idea of Substitution in the Doctrine of the Atonement. D. Cairns: The Theology of Emil Brunner. J. Heron: Newbigin, *The Reunion of the Church. A Defence of the S. India Scheme*. J. S. McEwen: Lacey, *Marriage in Church and State*, 2nd edit. J. W. D. Smith: Suttie, *The Origins of Love and Hate*. J. Macleod: Lawton, *Conflict in Christology* (critical). G. D. Henderson: Bell (ed.), *Documents on Christian Unity*, III, 1930-48; Mackenzie (ed.), *Truth, Unity and Concord*. F. W. Canfield: Barth, *Die Schrift und die Kirche*. J. McConnachie: Barth, *Die Protestantische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert*. March. Very Rev. G. S. Duncan: From Paul to Jesus. R. S. Wallace: The Parable and the Preacher. T. H. L. Parker: Calvin's Concept of Revelation. J. G. Matheeson: Calvin's Doctrine of the Christian Life. W. A. Whitehouse and J. B. Soucek: The Christian View of Man. An Examination of Karl Barth's Doctrine. J. H. S. Burleigh: Manson, *The Church's Ministry*. D. H. C. Read: *Catholicity*. A. M. Hunter: Barrett, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition* (critical). J. K. S. Reid: Maxwell, *Concerning Worship*.

The Expository Times (Vol. LX. Nos. 5-6. February-March, 1949. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark). Right Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson: Priesthood and Sacrifice in Judaism and Christianity. J. C. McKenzie: Freudian Psychology (March. "Psychology after Freud"). A. W. Argyle: The N.T. Doctrine of the Incarnation. Barry, *Recovery of Man*. Warren, *The Truth of Vision*. A. M. Hunter: Guy, *The N.T. Doctrine of the "Last Things"* (laudatory). W. D. Niven: Carpenter, *Thomas Tenison* (laudatory). W. Fulton: MacLennan, *Christian Obedience*. Greenslade, *The Church and the Social Order* ("most helpful and illuminating"). H. H. Rowley: Coppens, *La Définabilité de l'Assomption* and *Miscellanées Bibliques*, XI-XV. March. W. S. Urquhart: The Status of the Theologian in Philosophy. R. McVicar: Theology and Literature. Amsterdam 1948. Cadbury, *Jesus: What Manner of Man*. W. Barclay: Bonhoeffer, *The Cost of Discipleship* ("most remarkable"). A. J. Gossip: Escott, *Peter Taylor Forsyth* (1848-1921). W. D. Niven: Cadbury, *Fox's Book of Miracles*. Sanders, *Heresies, Ancient and Modern* (critical).

Nouvelle Revue Théologique (Tome 70. No. 10. Tome 71. Nos. 1-2. December 1948-February, 1948. Tournai: Casterman). H. Cazelles: La Place de la Théologie dans l'Enseignement de l'Ecriture sainte. E. Roche, S.J.: L'Homme de la Rédemption. J. Gonzette, S.J.: L'Autorité dans l'Anglicanisme. E. Bergh, S.J.: Les Instituts séculiers. A. van Cutsem, S.J.: Réflexions sur le Ministère auprès des Tuberculeux. Actes du Saint-Siège. F. Taymans, S.J.: Wheeler Robinson, *Inspiration and Revelation in the O.T.*; McGregor, *Aesthetic Experience in Religion*. E. Hambye, S.J.: Berkhof, *Kirche u. Kaiser*; O'Sullivan, *Cistercian Settlements in Wales*; Berteloot, *La Franc-maçonnerie et l'Eglise catholique*. J. Levie, S.J.: Seaver, *Albert Schweitzer*. January. J. Coppens: Les Harmonies des Deux Testaments, II. R. Laurentin: Marie et la Messe. Essai sur un Problème de Spiritualité sacerdotale. E. Bergh et H. Tihon, S.J.: Les Congrégations Mariales. J. Hamer, O.P.: Un Mouvement de Haute-Eglise en Suède. J. de Ghellinck, S.J.: Récentes Découvertes de Littérature chrétienne antique. Actes du Saint-Siège. C. Matagne, S.J.: Rowley, *The Rediscovery of the O.T. and The Relevance of Apocalyptic*. J. de Fraine, S.J.: Langton, *Good and Evil Spirits*. J. Gonsette, S.J.: *The Canon Law*

of the Church of England. February. L. Malavez, S.J. : La Vision chrétienne de l'Histoire. I. dans la Théologie de Karl Barth. R. Biot : Sexualité animale et Amour humain. R. Thibaut, S.J. : Le Problème des Prières inexaucées. F. Hermans : Newman est-il un Philosophe ? V. O. Keefe, S.J. : Education et Co-éducation catholique aux Etats-Unis. E. Hambye, S.J. : L'Eglise catholique en France sous l'Occupation. Actes du Saint-Siège. J. van Torre, S.J. : Van de Pol, *Het christelijk Dilemma. Katholieke Kerk-Reformatie* (laudatory). J. Levie, S.J. : Lebreton, *Lumen Christi*; Headlam, *The Fourth Gospel as History*; Huby, *Mystiques paulinienne et johannique*. J. Cochaux, S.J. : Cullmann, *Le Baptême des Enfants*.

Revue d'Histoire Ecclesiastique (Vol. XLIII. Nos. 3-4. 1948. Louvain : Université Catholique). C. Dereine : Les Coutumiers de Saint-Quentin de Beauvais et de Springersbach. E. Kwanten : Le Collège Saint-Bernard à Paris. Sa Fondation et ses Débuts. R. Bragard : Fénelon, Joseph-Clément de Bavière et le Jansénisme à Liège. A. Pelzer : Répertoire d'Incipit pour la Littérature latine, philosophique et théologique du Moyen Age. C. Dereine : Note sur l'Influence de la Règle de Grégoire VII pour Chanoines réguliers. M. Esposito : Notes sur le *Fortalicium Fidei* d'Alphonse de Spina. J. Kleyntjens : Activité charitable de Benoît XV. J. M. Vosté, O.P. : Hatch, *Album of Dated Syriac MSS.* (5 pp.). H. Pouillon : De Brugne, *Etudes d'Esthétique médiévale, I-III*. Dom H. Dauphin : Jones, *Saints' Lives and Chronicles in Early England* (6 pp.); Knowles, *The Religious Orders in England* (2 pp.); Besterman, *British Sources of Reference*; Steinberg, *Historical Tables 58 B.C.-A.D. 1945*; Kemp, *Canonization and Authority*; Baker and Bell, *St. Modwenna*; Hamand, *The Ancient Windows of Gt. Malvern Priory Church*; Pächt, *The Master of Mary of Burgundy*; Whiffen, *Stuart and Georgian Churches*; Middleton, *Newman and Bloxam*; Ward, *Young Mr. Newman*; Sencourt, *Life of Newman*; Gwynn, *Father Dominic Barberi*; Watt, *Thomas Chalmers*; Henson, *Retrospect of an Unimportant Life*; Moorman, B. K. Cunningham; *The Canon Law of the Church of England*. Dom M. Huglo : Bruckner, *Scriptoria Medii Aevi Helvetica, I-V* (3 pp.). R. Maere : Masai, *Les Origines de la Miniature irlandaise*. G. Drioux : Louis, *De l'Histoire à la Légende, Girart, I-III* (6 pp.). E. Lousse : Lejeune, *Liège et son Pays* (4 pp.). G. Garitte : Scaduto, *Il Monachismo basiliano nella Sicilia, sec. XI-XIV* (3 pp.). L. Bréhier : Rousset, *Les Origines et les Caractères de la Première Croisade* (laudatory). O. Lottin : Martin, *Oeuvres de Robert de Méln, III*. M. H. Vicaire : Kroon, *Det Svenska Prasimötet under Medeltiden*. A. Pelzer : Fowler, *Intellectual Interests of Engelbert of Admont*. O. Jodogne : Arnold, *Etude sur le "Livre des saintes Médecines" du Duc Henri de Lancastre*. P. Debognie : Kern, *Die Nachfolge Christi oder das Buch vom innern Trost von Gerrit Grote*. J. Scheerder : Verheyden, *Het Gentsche Martyrologium, 1530-95*. Dom L. Robert : Cristiani, *L'Eglise à l'Epoque du Concile de Trente*. J. J. Duin : Hansteen-Kundsen, *De Relationibus inter Sanctam Sedem et Norvegiam duobus primis post Reformationem saeculis vigentibus* (4 pp. critical). Dom J. W[arri-]low : Goad, *Greyfriars*. Chronique. Bibliographie.

Irénikon (Tome XXI. No. 4. 1948. Chevetogne, Belgique : Prieuré d'Amay). Y. M. J. Congar, O.P. : Pourquoi le Peuple de Dieu doit-il sans cesse se Réformer ? Dom T. Strotmann : Le Christ et le Temps. Dom C. Lialine : The Ecumenical Review. Chronique Religieuse. L. Cognet : Note sur le P. Quesnel et sur l'Ecclésiologie de Port-Royal, II. Dom C. L[ialine] : Phillips *Walter Howard Frere*.

Bijdragen (Vol. X. No. 1. 1949. Roermond : Romen & Zonen). H. Ruggers : Naar een Wijsgerige Sexuologie. Karakter en Waarde van de Aristotelisch-scholastische Synthese van Empirie en Philosophie (55 pp.).

A. Ampe : De Nederigheid in S. Ignatius' geestelijké Oefeningen (41 pp.).
 J. B. Poukens : De Jong, *Handboek der Kergeschiedenis*, vierde druk (6 pp.).
 U. Notebaert : Manders, *De Liefde in de Spiritualiteit van Sint Alfonsus*.

The English Historical Review (Vol. LXIII. No. 249. October, 1948. Longmans). D. Whitelock : Wulfstan and the Laws of Cnut. M. Hollings : The Survival of the Five Hide Unit in the Western Midlands. G. Davies : The Election of Richard Cromwell's Parliament, 1658-9. N. Gash : F. R. Bonham, Conservative "Political Secretary," 1832-47. Dom A. Morey and C. N. L. Brooke : The Cerne Letters of Gilbert Foliot and the Legation of Imar of Tusculum. U. Apps : The *Muntatores*—their Relation to other Military Tenures in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries. N. Sykes : The *Canon Law of the Church of England* (4½ pp.). Sir F. M. Powicke : Richardson and Sayles, *Select Cases . . . under Henry III*. E. B. Fryde : Renouard, *Les Relations des Papes d'Avignon et des Campagnes commerciales, 1316-78* ("very important"). J. H. Parry : Haring, *The Spanish Empire in America* (3½ pp.). O'Sullivan, *Cistercian Settlements in Wales and Monmouthshire* (1140-1540). Denholm-Young, *Richard of Cornwall*. Latham, *Bristol Charters* (1509-1899). Quinn, *Raleigh and the British Empire*. Schenk, *The Concern for Social Justice in the Puritan Revolution*. Cresson, *James Monroe*. H. A. R. G[ibb] : Rifaat Bey, *The Awakening of Modern Egypt*.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- DE BURGH, W. G.—*The Life of Reason*, 208 pp. (Macdonald & Evans). 15s.
- MCADOO, H. R.—*The Structure of Caroline Moral Theology*, 179 pp. (Longmans). 12s. 6d.
- TRETHOWAN, DOM ILLTYD.—*Certainty: Philosophical and Theological*, 170 pp. (Dacre Press). 15s.
- EASTON, BURTON SCOTT.—*The Pastoral Epistles*, 237 pp. (S.C.M. Press). 10s. 6d.
- EVANS, ERNEST (Ed. by).—*Tertullian's Treatise Against Praxeas*, 342 pp. (S.P.C.K.). 21s.
- MCALLUM, J. R.—*Abelard's Christian Theology*, 117 pp. (Basil Blackwell). 7s. 6d.
- MORRIS, WILLIAM DALE.—*The Christian Origins of Social Revolt*, 239 pp. (Allen & Unwin). 12s. 6d.
- JOHNSTONE, VERNEY.—*Learning to Pray with the Church* (The Bishop of London's Lent Book), 95 pp. (Longmans). 4s. 6d.
- VIDLER, ALEC.—*The Theology of F. D. Maurice*, 244 pp. (S.C.M. Press). 8s. 6d.
- PAUL, LESLIE.—*The Meaning of Human Existence*, 259 pp. (Faber and Faber). 16s.
- WRIGHT, MARJORY B.—*After Your Confirmation*, 99 pp. (Mowbray). 3s. 6d.
- BERDYAEV, NICOLAS.—*Towards a New Epoch*, 117 pp. (Geoffrey Bles). 6s.
- LEE, R. S.—*Freud and Christianity*, 204 pp. (James Clarke). 8s. 6d.
- PFISTER, OSCAR.—*Christianity and Fear*, 589 pp. (Allen and Unwin). 30s.
- HART, A. TINDAL.—*The Life and Times of John Sharp, Archbishop of York*, 352 pp. (S.P.C.K.). 21s.
- FARRER, AUSTIN.—*A Rebirth of Images*, 348 pp. (Dacre Press). 25s.
- WATTS, A. J.—*No New Thing*, 132 pp. (S.P.C.K. and National Society). 11s. 6d.
- ROBERTS, H. ERNEST.—*Medieval Monasteries and Minsters*, 160 pp. (S.P.C.K.). 12s. 6d.
- RAMSEY, ARTHUR MICHAEL.—*The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ*, 160 pp. (Longmans). 9s. 6d.
- FROMM, ERICH.—*Man for Himself*, 254 pp. (Routledge and Kegan Paul). 12s. 6d.
- CASSERLEY, J. V. LANGMEAD.—*The Christian in Philosophy*, 266 pp. (Faber and Faber). 18s.
- KNIGHT, GEORGE A. F.—*From Moses to Paul*, 194 pp. (Lutterworth Press). 15s.
- MARTIN, D. JOHNSTON.—*Ablaze yet not Consumed*, 194 pp. (Lutterworth Press). 8s. 6d.
- CULLMANN, OSCAR.—*The Earliest Christian Confessions*, 64 pp. (Lutterworth Press). 4s. 6d.
- WAND, J. W. C.—*The Authority of the Scriptures*, 119 pp. (Mowbray). 5s.
- DEWAR, LINDSAY.—*Psychology and the Parish Priest*, 122 pp. (Mowbray). 5s.
- GROVES, C. P.—*The Planting of Christianity in Africa*, 330 pp. (Lutterworth Press). 21s.

MESSINGER, E. C.—*Two in One Flesh: Vol. 1, Introduction to Sex and Marriage*, 61 pp. 6s. Vol. 2, *The Mystery of Sex and Marriage in Catholic Theology*, 236 pp. 10s. 6d. Vol. 3, *The Practice of Sex and Marriage*, 71 pp. 6s. (Sands).

POLAK, H. S. L., H. N. BRAILSFORD and LORD PETHICK-LAWRENCE.—*Mahatma Gandhi*, 320 pp. (Odhams Press). 12s. 6d.

VINE, A. R.—*An Approach to Christology*, 492 pp. (Independent Press). 21s.

"ANOMALY."—*The Invert and His Social Adjustment*, 290 pp. (2nd Edition). (Bailliere, Tindall). 8s. 6d.

The Official Year-Book of the Church of England, 1949, 563 pp. (Press and Publications Board of the Church Assembly and S.P.C.K.). 12s. 6d. By post 13s. 3d.

ROBINSON, WILLIAM.—*The Biblical Doctrine of the Church*, 235 pp. (The Bethany Press, St. Louis). 12s. 6d.

DUDLEY, OWEN FRANCIS.—*You, and Thousands Like You*, 127 pp. (Longmans). 6s. 6d.

OBOLENSKY, DMITRI.—*The Bogomils: A Study in Balkan Neo-Manichaeism*, 317 pp. (Cambridge University Press). 25s.

CAVE, C. J. P.—*Roof Bosses in Medieval Churches*, 235 pp. (Cambridge University Press). 35s.

THOMPSON, J. N.—*Do This in Remembrance of Me* (A Guide to the Service of Holy Communion), 47 pp. (Mowbray). 2s.

BUNYAN, JOHN.—*The Pilgrim's Progress* (Complete and Unabridged Edition), 256 pp. (Cherry Tree Book). 2s.

MELLOWS, W. T. (Ed. by).—*The Peterborough Chronicle of Hugh Candidus*, 251 pp. (Oxford University Press). 15s.

HILL, ROSALIND M. T. (Ed. by).—*The Rolls and Register of Bishop Oliver Sutton, 1280-1299*, 295 pp. (Lincoln Record Society).

GRÜNDLER, GEORG.—*Vom rechtschaffenen Studium der Theologie*, 195 pp. (C. Bertelsmann Verlag, Gütersloh). DM. 6.50.

ARMSTRONG, MAURICE W.—*The Great Awakening in Nova Scotia, 1776-1809*. 141 pp. (American Society of Church History, Hartford, Conn.). \$3.00.

REYNOLDS, REGINALD.—*The Wisdom of John Woolman*, 178 pp. (Allen and Unwin). 10s. 6d.

CAMERON-PRICE, G. W.—*The Mirror of God*, 124 pp. (Independent Press). 6s.

WATSON, ANGUS.—*A Bow at a Venture*, 178 pp. (Independent Press). 8s. 6d.

CARRICK SMITH, K. L.—*Sonship*, 59 pp. (Independent Press). 1s. 6d.

GOODALL, NORMAN.—*One Man's Testimony*, 128 pp. (Independent Press). 6s.

CURTIS, LIONEL.—*World Revolution in the Cause of Peace*, 167 pp. (Basil Blackwell). 7s. 6d.

The Mirfield Mission Hymn Book (New Edition), 279 pp. (Mowbray). 8s. 6d.

DE CONINCK, L.—*Problèmes de l'Adaptation en Apostolat*, 166 pp. (Casterman, Tournai, Belgium). 45 francs.

MATTHEW ARNOLD ON MILTON ¹

By E. M. W. TILLYARD

HOWEVER deeply we deplore the architectural destruction suffered by the City of London in the late war, we must admit a modicum of gain as well. Some slum areas were given an anticipatory clearance, and, whatever plan is chosen for laying out the ground round St. Paul's, future ages will enjoy a better view of Wren's architecture than was possible before 1940. The destruction which causes us to be here to-day bears a mixed character. The hole torn by a bomb fragment in a window commemorating the gentle and amiable wife and infant daughter of one of the world's great poets symbolizes sadly enough the cruel insensitiveness of total war to human virtue and to ecumenical culture; while, to turn to the smaller and more particular, the admirable work of the Rector of St. Margaret's in helping to have the damage made good represents a necessary sacrifice of energies that might have gone to create to energies that perforce go to replace. Yet this enforced restoration of damage has its good side. It has been skilfully carried out, and it points to more than one happy event.

The original window was the gift of an American, Mr. George W. Childs of Philadelphia, of whose cordial hospitality to many Englishmen Matthew Arnold spoke. It was through the happy initiative of Mr. Russell Smith that an appeal was

¹ An address delivered in St. Margaret's, Westminster, on July 4, 1949, to commemorate the restoration of the window in memory of Milton's second wife, which had been damaged by bomb fragments in the 1939-1945 war.

issued for money to make good the damage the window suffered in the war. This appeal was answered by donations from both sides of the Atlantic. There were in 1888, when the window was dedicated, many ties of friendship existing between Great Britain and the United States of America, and Mr. Childs's action of personal generosity created one of them. To-day one hopes those ties are stronger; yet they are different, depending on greater mutual knowledge, a profounder critical spirit, and a measure of political co-operation which in the year 1888 would have been regarded as fabulous. In its small way this joint responsibility for making good in St. Margaret's, Westminster, the damage of war, represents the new approximation of the two countries.

The committee which Canon Charles Smyth, as Rector of St. Margaret's, collected to sponsor the appeal included different types of religious and political opinion. In so doing it represented one of the largest changes that has occurred in England between 1888 and the present day; the drawing together of Church and Chapel. It was Matthew Arnold who delivered an address in this church when the memorial window was dedicated; and one of the ways in which to bring home to ourselves the changed relations between Church and Chapel is to read what he said about the Nonconformists. It is not that he was unfair, however critical, but that as a Churchman he spoke of an alien community. To exaggerate this drawing together would be easy; and there are still probably small towns or large villages in England where Churchmen deal with the Church grocer and Dissenters with the Chapel grocer. Nevertheless in the matter of mutual accessibility the change has been revolutionary. I believe Milton would have welcomed the change. Though he may appear to represent a doctrine of individual liberty especially dear to Nonconformity, he was a Churchman half his life. And if he inveighed against the Episcopacy, he did so—more than he realized himself—mainly for political reasons. That the social cleavage between Church and Chapel resulting from the Civil War should have lasted over two centuries he would have deplored, for he never carried

his doctrinal differences into personal relations. We have only to think of his social success in Catholic Italy and of Aubrey's account of Dryden's visit to him. Dryden, the High Churchman and subsequent Catholic, sought Milton's leave to adapt the blank verse of *Paradise Lost* to his rhymed drama, *The State of Innocence*. Milton, though mildly satirical in his reply—he gave Dryden “leave to tag his verses”—received him civilly.

But above all, the present repair of the window should indicate a renewed belief in Milton's eminence as a poet. Of that eminence Matthew Arnold, in his noble dedicatory address, had no fraction of doubt. Milton for him represented an “ideal of high and rare excellence” which in the field of literature was the perfect antidote for that tendency to the average and the mediocre which according to Arnold is the particular crime of the Anglo-Saxon race. And his essay mainly concerns Milton's moral and stylistic elevation. To-day it is fitting that I should speak briefly of some changes in men's opinion of Milton that have taken place since Arnold delivered his address here just over 60 years ago, on February 13, 1888.

“What other poet”, wrote Arnold, “has shown so sincere a sense of the grandeur of his vocation, and a moral effort so constant and sublime to make and keep himself worthy of it?” In spite of one attempt to interpret Milton's character in terms of pride, of another in terms of Machiavellian mendacity and ruthlessness, and a third in terms of compensation for the sense of smallness set up by an inherited physical disability, the opinion still prevails that Milton was devoted to his art and that he went in awe of the solemn terms on which life is lived on this earth.

Arnold's advancement of Milton as the supreme master of the grand style in English has fared less well. For one thing, his meaning is not clear. He was taken to mean, and I think wrongly, that his long poems at any rate exhibit from first to last a style of sustained grandeur, of unremitting reverberation. Such an exhibition, at a time when fashion favoured Edgar Allen Poe's opinion that a long poem was impossible, could only imply an intolerable strain and monotony; and Milton's

verse, partly on a too easy acceptance of what Arnold can hardly have meant, has incurred that type of censure. A very little attention to the actual poetry will disprove it. The tone of many passages is moderate or even gentle. Take these lines from *Paradise Regained* spoken by Christ about the heathen philosophers:

Alas what can they teach, and not mislead;
Ignorant of themselves, of God much more,
And how the world began, and how man fell
Degraded by himself, on grace depending?
Much of the Soul they talk, but all awrie,
And in themselves seek vertue, and to themselves
All glory arrogate, to God give none,
Rather accuse him under usual names,
Fortune and Fate, as one regardless quite
Of mortal things.

Or take those lines of Samson, in reply to his father's well-meaning attempt to comfort him, that Samuel Johnson so much admired. Not only are they hushed in tone but eight out of the nine are end-stopt in flat contradiction of Milton's supposed invariable habit of sustaining his rhythms:

All otherwise to me my thoughts portend,
That these dark orbs no more shall treat with light,
Nor th'other light or life continue long,
But yield to double darkness nigh at hand:
So much I feel my genial spirits droop,
My hopes all flat, nature within me seems
In all her functions weary of herself:
My race of glory run, and race of shame,
And I shall shortly be with them that rest.

But if Arnold meant that Milton invented a scheme of rhetoric to which he was ever loyal and which constituted a technical standard of uncommon severity then he spoke the truth and indicated a reason why between 1888 and 1949 Milton's reputation has fluctuated. Alike in conversation, in written prose, and in verse, fashion moves between certain extremes of formality and informality. A well-bred young

woman of the upper middle class speaks more informally in the twentieth century than she did in Jane Austen's day; Samuel Johnson invented a more formal prose than suited Swift; the poetic diction of Donne is nearer the informality of the spoken word than is Spenser's. In spite of many cross-currents, in spite of Browning and Hardy, the late Victorian Age favoured formality. A typical good piece of expository prose like Maine's *Ancient Law* was formal and exalted in a way which would be shocking to-day. The most typical and influential poets, the Pre-Raphaelites, had their own very marked formalities. When, as was bound to happen, the Pre-Raphaelite manner grew stale, the poets sought renewal through introducing the informality of the language and of the rhythms of everyday speech. Thus Yeats, in spite of his Pre-Raphaelite antecedents, can write near the end of his life in a lyric:

"Drown all the dogs" said the fierce young woman,
 "They killed my goose and my cat.
 Drown, drown in the water butt,
 Drown all the dogs" said the fierce young woman.

And Mr. Eliot near the opening of a religious poem writes:

Why should I mourn
 The vanished power of the usual reign?

where the informal word "usual" sounds fresh largely because it had lain fallow in Victorian poetry. Now Milton, though he can write quietly and can use simple words (the word "usual" occurs in the passage read from *Paradise Regained*), is, through the order of his words, always formal and rhetorical. He thus represented a stylistic tendency adverse to that of the twentieth century, and, becoming less apt to influence contemporary production, he lost some of his influence. Such loss is but temporary. In time the fashion will change again, and Milton will not only be a great classic but an inspiration to the creative writer. Indeed the change may have begun already.

Arnold's speech was brief and uncontroversial. He did not mention one matter of controversy in which recent opinion has greatly improved on the Victorian. Ever since the age of

the French Revolution and Blake's assertion that Milton was on the Devil's side without knowing it, many of the ablest and most enthusiastic readers of *Paradise Lost* have made Satan its hero and centred the poem's significance in him. "It is in Satan", wrote Lancelles Abercrombie, "that the imperishable significance of *Paradise Lost* is centred; his vast unyielding agony symbolizes the profound antinomy of the modern consciousness". This opinion no longer preponderates. Scholars are now more aware of the medieval literary tradition and of how long its influence lingered, and they see that in one of its aspects *Paradise Lost* is a version of the Morality theme of Everyman, showing Adam and Eve the central figures, the hero and heroine, fought for by the powers of heaven and hell. Further, world events have forced us to study the dictator-type, which Satan so superbly represents. We now know (as we should never have forgotten) that to be greatly bad a man must have correspondingly great potentialities for good. That Milton should have depicted such potentialities in Satan argues not his covert approval but his sound knowledge of the dictator-type.

Through seeing Satan aright, we may judge better on another controversial matter which Arnold mentioned only to avoid: that is the theology of what he calls "the inevitable matter of a Puritan epic". Here again recent opinion has taken a better turn. Whatever weight we give to Milton's heresies, his Arianism, his beliefs that the soul died with the body and that God created the world not out of nothing but out of himself, we now see that Milton did not sympathize with Satanic pride but that, recognizing the temptation to pride in himself, he passionately embraced and expressed the ethics of Christian humility. Indeed the very structure of *Paradise Lost* is an ironic exposure of the weakness of Satanic pride (for all the reverberant protests of its power) when matched with the smallest manifestation of sincere and regenerate human feeling. Out of the apparent triumph of Satan, the eating of the apple and all the chaos that follows it, emerges the homely

and miniature spectacle of two human beings coming together after their quarrel and admitting humbly their faults.

That this irony (at Satan's expense and in assertion of the doctrine of humility) is the core of *Paradise Lost* is clear from the final recapitulatory dialogue between Adam and Michael near the end of the poem, after Michael has revealed the world's future history. When in it Adam speaks of defeating strong things by weak, we are meant to recall the grandiosities of Satan and the homeliness of Eve's reconciliation with Adam. Here is the speech:

He ended, and thus Adam last replied:
How soon hath thy prediction, seer blest,
Measur'd this transient world, the race of time,
Till time stand fixt: beyond is all abyss,
Eternity, whose end no eye can reach.
Greatly instructed I shall hence depart,
Greatly in peace of thought, and have my fill
Of knowledge, what this vessel can contain;
Beyond which was my folly to aspire.
Henceforth I learn that to obey is best,
And love with fear the only God, to walk
As in his presence, ever to observe
His providence, and on him sole depend
Merciful over all his works; with good
Still overcoming evil, and by small
Accomplishing great things, by things deem'd weak
Subverting worldly strong, and worldly wise
By simple meek: that suffering for truth's sake
Is fortitude to highest victory,
And, to the faithful, death the gate of life:
Taught this by his example whom I now
Acknowledge my redeemer ever blest.

Though so soberly spoken there is as much passion in these words as in Satan's better known defiances in the first book.

And if we give these words their weight we may hope in some ways for a better understanding of *Paradise Lost* than was possible when Matthew Arnold gave his memorable address in this church.

ARCHBISHOP WINCHELSEY : FROM HIS ELECTION TO HIS ENTHRONEMENT

By ROSE GRAHAM

REGISTER OF ARCHBISHOP WINCHELSEY, ed. R. Graham (Canterbury and York Society). David Wilkins, *Concilia II* (1737).

CORPUS JURIS CANONICI, ed. E. Friedberg (1879-81). H. G. Mann, *The Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages* xvii.

ARCHBISHOP Peckham died at Mortlake on December 8, 1292. Among those present in the house was one of the Canterbury monks, John of Wy, who probably carried the news to the cathedral monastery. The dead archbishop had once threatened to leave his body for burial among his brethren, the Franciscans, two of whom were with him at Mortlake. The funeral took place at Canterbury on December 19, in the presence of the Bishops of London and Rochester, the abbots of St. Augustine's, Faversham and Langdon, and other witnesses whose names are recorded.

The prior of the cathedral monastery was Henry of Eastry, elected in 1285. He ruled for a longer span than any other prior between the Conquest and the Dissolution, and showed his shrewdness and business capacity in the election of a successor to Archbishop Peckham ; he had previously strengthened the prior's council by employing skilled lawyers.

Both Peckham and his predecessor Kilwardby had been provided to the see by the Popes. The papacy was vacant. Nicholas IV died eight months before Peckham, on April 4 ; and the twelve cardinals were unable to agree on a worthy suc-

cessor. Their discord lasted for more than two years, until July 5, 1294.

Prior Eastry and the monks seized the opportunity to elect the archbishop. With one or two doubtful exceptions it was the only occasion from this time until the Dissolution on which the archbishop was not provided by the Pope or translated by him or elected under pressure by the King. The proceedings are fully recorded in Register Q at Canterbury and in another Canterbury manuscript (MS. Add. 6159) in the British Museum. The distinguished Lambeth Librarian, David Wilkins, printed some extracts from Register Q which he called the Register of Prior Henry in the *Concilia*.

Knowledge of the Canon Law is manifest at every stage of the election. In the monks' library there were numerous copies of the Decretum of Gratian and of the Decretals of Gregory IX. Prior Eastry possessed twenty-nine works on the Canon Law when he died, another senior monk left several to the library. John of Selveston, a canon of St. Paul's and official of the Bishop of London, had drawn a pension for some years as a skilled lawyer on the prior's council ; he was present at the funeral of Archbishop Peckham and ready to give advice. A public notary was employed to prepare the formal records.

According to the Canon Law the election to a vacant see must be held within three months. The prior and monks met in chapter and took the first step of asking Edward I for licence to elect. Their letter to the King telling him of Peckham's death and requesting the *cong   d'   lire* was dated December 22, and two of the monks, Walter of Chillenden and John of Wy, set out to find the King. They delivered the letter to him at Newcastle-on-Tyne where he had kept Christmas, and as overlord of Scotland had received the homage of John Balliol. On January 8, 1293, Edward I issued letters patent granting the prior and convent licence to elect an archbishop who should be devoted to God, necessary for the governance of their church, useful and faithful to the King and the kingdom. The monks rode home in the short winter days and Edward I's

letter was read in the chapter on January 22. The next day, in the presence of all the monks who were in the monastery and close by, it was decided to proceed to the election on February 13, the Friday after Ash Wednesday. This announcement was made to the clergy and people from the loft over the screen at the west end of the choir of the cathedral church. There were solemn processions and devotions by day and by night ; the clergy and people of the city and diocese were stirred up to take their part.

On the following day letters sealed in the chapter were sent to all the bishops of the province of Canterbury and to some chapters of cathedral churches, asking for their prayers for the soul of Archbishop Peckham and for the guidance of the Holy Spirit in the election of a successor under whose rule there should be a prosperous peace and tranquillity in the kingdom and the Church. The letter was adorned with the flowers of rhetoric : “ God, the ruler of the world, has cut down from the wood the tall tree loaded with the fruits of virtues which his right hand had planted like another tree of life in the midst of our paradise, one whose holiness gave out a fragrant scent, by the rays of whose wisdom the whole world began to shine, to whose teaching the universal church looks back. The church of Canterbury has put off her robe of delight and instead of the cloak of praise, she wears a doublet of grief under the vesture of mourning ”.

On January 26 mandates to two absent monks to be present at the coming election were sealed in the chapter. Early on the morning of the election, February 13, the precentor and a penitentiary went to visit a sick monk ; they asked him to get up and come to the chapter house. Stephen of Codford said that he was much too ill ; he agreed that the election should be by compromise and made the precentor his proxy. The services of the hours and masses followed. After none the bell for chapter was rung, the monks came into the chapter house and all the church doors were shut except the great doors of the nave. After the martyrology, the prior read a solemn admonition

against anyone publicly or secretly hindering the election. The proceedings set out in the Chapters of Title VI *De Electione* of the first book of the Decretals of Gregory IX were followed step by step. The prior read the general absolution. Two of the monks brought in the consecrated Host and the famous relic known as the Corona of St. Thomas of Canterbury—the crown of his head which was supposed to have been struck off at his martyrdom, and was kept in the form of a mitred bust. The hymn, “Come, Holy Spirit,” was sung kneeling, the prior read the collects, and afterwards the monks sat back in their seats. There was silence for the reading of the constitution of the Lateran Council governing elections, the *Quia Propter*. There were three methods of election : by individual voting, *per viam scrutinii* ; by the choice of a certain number to elect in the name of the community, *per compromissum* ; or by acclamation, the uncontradicted declaration of the common wish of the whole body. The prior asked the monks, one by one, by which method they would proceed : all chose the way of compromission by which they delegated to others the right of voting, except two, one older and one younger monk, who thought it better to adopt the method of scrutiny, i.e. individual voting, but they fell in with the wishes of the majority. All agreed that there should be seven compromissaries, the usual number. Prior Eastry suggested the subprior, the precentor and one of the penitentiaries, and that these three should choose four others, two from the right side of the choir, two from the left. All the seven were senior monks.

The compromissaries, either all or the majority, were charged to elect one of the monks or someone outside their body ; a pledge to accept the man of their choice was given by the chapter, written and sealed with the common seal. The seven withdrew into the library, a large bookroom adjoining the cloister. They discussed the merits and circumstances of many persons. Sometime previously, when it was rumoured that Archbishop Peckham might be created a cardinal, the monks began to talk about a successor, and the Archdeacon of Canterbury was mentioned ; one of the monks urged Prior Eastry to

put a stop to these discussions as not befitting the honour of their church. According to the Decretals of Gregory IX an election had been invalidated because the discussion about a successor began before the funeral of a bishop. The monks had time to say seven psalms and the litany before the electors came back to the chapter house. The subprior then announced that they had agreed unanimously on Robert Winchelsey, Archdeacon of Essex, canon of St. Paul's, doctor of theology, a prudent and discreet man, to be commended for learning and character, most circumspect in spiritual and temporal affairs. They had chosen a distinguished scholar of middle age. Twenty-five years before, in 1268, after taking the degree of Master of Arts in Paris, he became rector of that university. Subsequently he pursued his studies at Oxford, became a doctor of theology, and in 1288 chancellor of the university. Ecclesiastical preferments came to him, a canonry of Lincoln, a canonry of St. Paul's, and he lectured on theology in London. He was well known, not only at Oxford, but in ecclesiastical circles. He was one of four arbitrators proposed by the Bishop of Hereford in 1288 to the Bishop of St. Asaph in a boundary dispute, all of them said to be distinguished for learning and character ; two others were soon afterwards closely associated with Winchelsey, William of Sardinia, Dean of the Arches, and John of Selveston, canon of St. Paul's and official of the Bishop of London. The election was conducted strictly in accordance with the Canon Law, and fulfilled the obligation that the archbishop was chosen by the greater and wiser part of the chapter. It was probably influenced by Prior Eastry and his chief legal adviser, Canon John of Selveston. Winchelsey's biographer wrote of him that as a young man he was very handsome, charming and pleasant, and of a kindly disposition. His personality perhaps weighed as much with the electors as his scholarship.

Immediately after the subprior's announcement to the monks in the chapter house, a formal document was sealed with the common seal. The monks went in procession to the choir and sang the *Te Deum*. The penitentiary, Martin de Clive,

went up to the loft over the screen and announced the election to the clergy and people assembled in great numbers in the nave ; he spoke to them in Latin and in their mother tongue. They went away rejoicing. The monks entered the refectory for dinner.

Letters were written to the archbishop elect and to the King ; the first was adorned with flowers of rhetoric and sealed in the chapter ; the second was an open letter requesting the King's consent. The election was on Friday and according to the Canon Law the Archbishop Elect must be notified within a month. On the following Monday, February 16, the prior and two of the electors, accompanied by John of Selveston, several clerks and a public notary, Hugh de Musele, left Canterbury in search of Winchelsey. A week later they found him at his Lincoln prebend, Leighton Manor in Huntingdonshire. The electors presented the letter from the chapter to Archdeacon Winchelsey informing him of his election, and they requested his consent. He heard them kindly and replied that he would like to think over it, until the next day, the feast of St. Matthias, February 24. On the morrow Winchelsey celebrated the Mass of the Blessed Virgin Mary in the chapel ; Masses of St. Matthias and of St. Thomas the Martyr followed. Immediately afterwards the letter from the chapter of Canterbury was read in the presence of clerks and laymen. Winchelsey began to make excuses ; at last he yielded to the entreaties of Prior Eastry and the monks, and consented in tears. The public notary made a formal record in these words : " I, Robert of Winchelsey, being unwilling to resist the will of God, for the honour of the Trinity, of the Blessed Virgin Mary and of the blessed Thomas the Martyr consent to my election as Archbishop of Canterbury ".

On the morrow the archbishop elect, accompanied by Prior Eastry and others, went to find the King who was near Nottingham, and they presented the letter from the chapter asking for his consent. Edward I replied that he wished to consider the letter until the next day. After Mass on the mor-

row, in the presence of the King and his counsellors, Antony Bek, Bishop of Durham, read the King's formal approval and pledge of support. All the persons of both sexes who were with the King greeted the election and the archbishop elect with applause. On March 3, at Garendon in Leicestershire, Edward I granted protection for one year to the archbishop elect going to the Court of Rome. Master William of Sardinia accompanying him was also protected. Edward I had letters written to be taken to the future Pope and to the Cardinals.

At Canterbury a formal record of the election proceedings, called the Decretum, was prepared for the Pope with a request that he would confirm the election and arrange for the consecration of the archbishop elect. It was dated and sealed in the chapter on March 20; the names of all the monks who had consented to the election were given, but they were written in one hand, a grave error, for according to the Decretum of Gratian, their individual signatures were required. The document was entrusted to Master William of Sardinia, beloved clerk of Archbishop Peckham, who had been sent by him on a mission to the Curia in 1284. Four of the Canterbury monks were chosen to go with the archbishop elect: three of them from the seven electors, and one of these was Robert of Selsey who had been sent to the Curia in 1283 by Archbishop Peckham on an important mission to try to recover the earlier registers of the archbishops which his predecessor, Kilwardby, was believed to have taken to Rome. They have been missing ever since.

On March 23 Winchelsey started from Hollingbourne, near Maidstone. A public notary recorded that before the archbishop elect mounted his horse he announced in Latin and in English that he had still two months from the date of his consent on which to seek confirmation at the Curia in accordance with the constitution of Pope Nicholas III, *Cupientes*. He rode with his clerks and servants to Chartham, a manor of the prior and chapter. At Chartham the three monks who were chosen from the electors said aloud in the presence of witnesses and of a public notary that they were on their way

to the Curia to seek the confirmation of the archbishop elect. They were given a hundred marks towards their travelling expenses and a document enabling them to borrow up to six hundred marks. The party crossed from Dover on April 1, 1293, with no thought that they would not return to England until January 1, 1295. When they landed at Wissant, near Cape Gris-Nez, they were met by the Count of Boulogne's bailiff. He claimed for his lord on the first coming of an archbishop the better of his baggage horses with its load and harness, and he declared that the archbishop's steward was bound to put down a heap of sterling coins, and he could take as many as he could grasp and hold in his hands joined. For these payments the archbishop, his household and messengers would be free from tolls throughout the Count's lands during the life of the archbishop. Winchelsey told the bailiff that he was not archbishop, his election had not been confirmed, he was merely a clerk of the chapter of Canterbury, and the prior and chapter and all their clerks and messengers had been free from tolls and payments from time immemorial by charters of the Counts of Boulogne. If he should return that way as archbishop, he would render whatever was due by law and custom. The archbishop elect passed on with the monks and others in their company. Their journey through France and Italy to Rome took just over six weeks.

The tale of their long stay in Italy is told in seven of the letters written to the prior and chapter by Winchelsey and the monks. Prior Eastry endorsed the letters with the dates on which they reached Canterbury. The company arrived in Rome on Whit Sunday, May 17. The monks had spent all the money provided for the journey, and they found themselves in financial difficulties. They had documents enabling them to contract loans, but when they presented them to several firms of merchants at the Curia, all replied that their representatives in London had not authorized them to lend money, and all refused. At last through the mediation of friends, the Florentine firm of the Pulci advanced two hundred marks as a favour with interest at fifteen per cent.

The archbishop elect visited the two Colonna cardinals and John Boccamazza who were still in Rome. Eight other cardinals had already gone to Rieti to escape the heat and the twelfth, Benedict Gaetani, the future Boniface VIII, was at Viterbo. Winchelsey and his companions soon followed him and passed the next few months at the monastery of San Martino in Monte near that city. Only nine days after arriving in Rome, Winchelsey wrote urgently from San Martino to Prior Eastry reminding him of a previous letter asking him to send two copies of the election Decretum, one for the future pope, the other for the cardinals. These copies must have the individual signatures of the monks ; in the copy given to Master William of Sardinia all the signatures were in one hand. A charge of forgery might be brought. The lawyers whom he had consulted at the Curia had also advised him that the precentor and Robert of Selsey should be given letters for the pope and the cardinals appointing them to present the Decretum in accordance with the Canon Law, and he told the prior how to draft the letters. His letter, dated May 26, reached Canterbury on July 14. Another letter, dated June 2, arrived a week earlier on July 7. Winchelsey had then visited all the cardinals who were at Rieti ; and as in Rome all received him most graciously, kissed him and talked very affably. He reminded the prior that for various reasons the cardinals were unable to agree on a future pope, and his own election could not be confirmed ; when it came forward it would require open hands to give bountifully. There was a perceptible note of pride as he told the prior that his reputation at the Curia had preceded him ; the expectant eyes of all, the greater and the lesser men at the Curia, were on an archbishop elect, distinguished for learning and character.

Letters were slow in reaching Canterbury. Winchelsey and the monks near Viterbo awaited replies in anxiety and distress. On July 11 Winchelsey wrote that he had frequently sent messengers to ask for fresh copies of the Decretum with individual signatures. " If any of the monks cannot write, this is the formula : ' Because I do not know how to write, I sub-

scribe by the hand of ——.' He must make his mark before the signature and after or at least after". On August 4 the precentor and his companions wrote an urgent appeal to the prior and chapter for help in their financial difficulties. The money they had borrowed from the Florentine firm of the Pulci in Rome was all spent, they had sold most of their horses and borrowed a hundred and fifty marks in small sums from clerks and laymen. All the merchants of firms in Florence, Siena and Pistoia refused any advances unless and until their representatives in London sent a formal authorization. The plight of the monks was well known ; it was a reproach to the fame of the Church of Canterbury that the proctors of the chapter should have to beg. They entreated the prior and chapter, as they valued the honour of their Church, to arrange with the merchants of Florence, Siena and Pistoia in England for loans, and to ask them to desire their representatives at the Curia to commend the business of the Canterbury election to the cardinals and their friends. The monks had pledged three bonds to the firm of the Rembertini ; they had hardly enough money to cover their expenses to Michaelmas, and owed various creditors a hundred and forty marks. Their letter continued : " There is a hope that we shall soon have a pope ; to-day there are eight cardinals at Rieti, two thirds of the college and they are all of the party of the Orsini ". They made this clear reference to the Decretals of Gregory IX that if there was discord in the college of cardinals the pope could be elected by a two-thirds majority. In conclusion the monks wrote : " It is generally believed that as soon as there is a pope, our business will have first consideration. May God Almighty relieve us from frustration. When the pope is elected, we shall have to give away large sums of money ". On receiving this letter of distress Prior Eastry got in touch with the London representatives of the Italian merchants with all possible speed. On September 16 he wrote to tell Winchelsey that the Florentine merchants in London of the firm of the Pulci were more accommodating than others, and recommending them for the purpose of getting advances.

The hope of a speedy election of a pope faded. After a wrangle between the cardinals at Rieti and the three in Rome, it was agreed that all should meet at Perugia on October 18; they continued to discuss and quarrel in that city for eight months longer. Winchelsey and the monks waited on, spending money for necessary expenses. In Holy Week 1294 they were again in Rome and in good health. On Maundy Thursday, April 15, Winchelsey wrote to Eastry referring to a recent letter with a suggestion that the prior should try to get a loan through the Bishop of Winchester; his clerk, Nicholas the Roman, promised his help and would tell Eastry about the state of affairs at the Curia. That letter took ten weeks to reach Canterbury on June 28. On May 31 Winchelsey and the monks were at Perugia, waiting for the election of a pope; the cardinals were still unable to agree, and he again requested Eastry to arrange with the Bishop of Winchester for a loan from the money collected for a crusade under the Taxation of Pope Nicholas.

On July 5, 1294, the cardinals elected the hermit Peter de Morone, "a man of little literary culture and of absolutely no knowledge of worldly affairs, but a man, so it is said, of extraordinary sanctity." Peter was at his monastery on Monte Morone, near Aquila, and was persuaded that at his age he could not travel to Rome or Perugia in summer heat, so the cardinals were constrained to take the journey of a hundred and fifty miles from Perugia. Celestine V was consecrated Pope in the church of Our Lady of Collemaggio, about half a mile from Aquila on August 29. The belief that the business of the Canterbury election would come speedily before the Curia was justified. Winchelsey and the Canterbury monks followed the cardinals to Aquila. The precentor and Robert of Selsey presented the election Decretum to Celestine V and Winchelsey requested him to confirm it; he appointed three cardinals to examine the Decretum, they gave a most favourable report of the qualifications of the archbishop elect and testified that the election was in accordance with the Canon Law. Celestine V confirmed it on Monday, September 6. Gerard, cardinal

Bishop of Sabina, consecrated Winchelsey at Aquila on Sunday, September 12. As soon as he was consecrated, the archbishop sent one of the monks to ask the Pope for the pallium, a simple scarf of lamb's wool laid on the tomb of St. Peter in Rome. A metropolitan would not consider himself in possession of the plenitude of his power had he not been to seek the pallium from the Pope or received it from the hands of a pontifical delegate. The pallium was bestowed on Winchelsey on September 17 and he took this oath: I, Robert, Archbishop of Canterbury, from this hour henceforward will be faithful and obedient to St. Peter and the Holy Apostolic Church of Rome and to my lord Pope Celestine and his canonical successors. I will not be party by counsel or consent or deed by which they lose life or limb or are imprisoned. I will not knowingly reveal the counsel which they shall give me to their loss. I will be a helper and defender of the Roman Church and the regalia of St. Peter against all men, saving my order. I will not sell, grant or pledge the possessions of the archbishopric or alienate them in any way without consulting the Roman pontiff. So help me God and the Holy Gospels.

Winchelsey sent off a messenger immediately to tell the prior and monks of Canterbury of the long awaited confirmation. His letter was read in chapter and the bells were rung. On such an occasion of rejoicing it is likely that these were the five large bells which required ten, ten, eleven, eight and twenty-four men to ring them. The glad news was published in the cathedral church. Bulls of Celestine V with the formal announcement of the archbishop's confirmation and consecration dated September 24 were brought to England by Walter of Dunbridge. He delivered the bull for the prior and chapter at Canterbury on November 21. He went in the company of the Dean of St. Paul's, the precentor of that cathedral and Thomas of Chartham, one of the late archbishop's clerks, to take the bull to Edward I who was in the Marches of Wales, and to ask on behalf of the archbishop for the restoration of the

temporalities. The King replied that he would only give them to the archbishop in person on his taking the oath of fealty.

After paying heavy fees at the Curia, Winchelsey bade farewell to Celestine V and the college of cardinals, and left Aquila on October 5. He and his companions were at Siena on October 14, and an entry in the archbishop's Register tells their names; the four Canterbury monks who had left England with him, William of Sardinia, now canon of St. Paul's, and John de Bestan, Rector of Cliff, both of them professors of canon and civil law, three clerks, the rectors of Ockham, Dimchurch and Godmanchester, all designated Masters, and Hugh de Musele, the public notary, a clerk of the diocese of Lincoln. France and England were now at war, so the company travelled home through Germany and Brabant to Dordrecht in Holland. Thence they took ship for Yarmouth and arrived on January 1, 1295. Prior Eastry came to meet the archbishop at Norwich and brought the ecclesiastical ornaments used by Archbishop Peckham, among them his mitre, vestments, pastoral staff, gloves, processional cross and three gold pins to hold the pallium in place. On the Feast of the Epiphany, Thursday, January 6, Archbishop Winchelsey celebrated High Mass in the cathedral church of Norwich and wore his pallium for the first time. Prior Eastry and three of the monks returned to Canterbury, the fourth stayed in charge of the ecclesiastical ornaments until he delivered them to the archbishop's chaplain at Lambeth on March 7. The election had cost the monastery of Canterbury the immense sum of over £3,000.

The archbishop was heavily in debt and left Norwich without delay in search of the King to ask for the restoration of the temporalities. On Sunday, after the Feast of the Epiphany he lodged at Barnwell Priory near Cambridge; the Augustinian Canons, wearing silk copes, Friars, Masters of the University and priests went in solemn procession to meet him and there was great rejoicing. The King was at Conway, where he had gone with an army to put down a dangerous rebellion of the Welsh. Winchelsey arrived on February 2, the Feast

of the Purification. The King demanded the oath of fealty in these words: "You will swear that you will be faithful and loyal from this day forward to King Edward of England and to Edward his son, and will bear fealty of life and limb and earthly honour, so God and his saints help you." The archbishop paused to deliberate on the form of the oath, then put his hand on his breast and spoke these words: "The oath which my predecessors, the Archbishops of Canterbury were wont and bound to take to you and your ancestors for the temporalities of the archbishopric I understand to take and offer it loyally, so God and the saints help me." He kissed the feet of the crucifix on the cross he wore. The King wondered greatly, but he answered: "We restore to you the temporalities of the archbishopric." The writ was dated February 4. Two days later, at Conway, Winchelsey issued a commission to the Bishop of St. Asaph to excommunicate Madoc, Prince of Wales, and his supporters on account of their appalling cruelty, burning and ravaging the countryside, butchering men and women alike, leaving the dead unburied to be torn by birds and beasts of prey, as the archbishop had seen with his own eyes. He left Conway on his way back, was at Lambeth on March 1, passed through Croydon and Tenham and came to Canterbury on March 18. All the monks in copes came in procession to meet him at the cemetery gate. He dismounted, kissed the crosses and the book of the Gospels and followed the procession into the cathedral church. After a solemn chant and the reading of collects Prior Eastry told the archbishop of the long established custom that on his first coming he should promise to observe their liberties and approved customs, whereupon he took the oath before the high altar. The procession to the shrine of St. Thomas and the chapel of the Trinity followed. The monks went back to their stalls and the archbishop kissed the prior and all in turn. He then entered the chapter house and preached to the monks, the clergy and people. He was not enthroned until Sunday, October 2, when the King was able to be present. Invitations to bishops, earls and barons, knights, abbots, priors, deans and archdeacons were entered in the archbishop's

Register. Edward I, his brother, and Prince Edward stayed at the monastery of St. Augustine's ; the Bishops of London, Lincoln, Ely, Norwich, Rochester, Hereford and Durham were present, the Earls of Gloucester, Lincoln, Pembroke, Hereford and Warwick and very many nobles and prelates. There is a full description of the service of the enthronement. The prior reverently took the archbishop under the arms and seated him in the marble chair in which Archbishops of Canterbury are still enthroned, saying "In the name of God, Amen. By his authority I Henry, prior of Christ Church, enthrone thee Robert, Archbishop of this Church of Canterbury, and may the Lord Jesus Christ watch over thy coming in from now and for ever." The archbishop celebrated Mass. After the service he took off his sacred vestments, went to his room in his palace, put on his festival vestments and went into the great hall where he received the King, and all sat down to a splendid banquet. Gilbert de Clare, the Red Earl, served as seneschal and cup-bearer. The bill for the banquet amounted to £513. No meat is mentioned, but there were many kinds of fish, salmon, herrings, white and red, salt sturgeon, eels, lampreys, seals and porpoises, pike, tench and carp. Red and white wines were provided, claret, malmsey and wine "de Reans," beer of London and beer of Canterbury and English beer, a little cheaper than the other two. After the feast the archbishop led the King, all the bishops and great nobles from the hall to another room in the palace to take spices as was customary after food. The amount charged for spices was £30, and probably included ginger, almonds, sugar-plums and prunes. Then the King returned to the monastery of St. Augustine's, other guests went joyously away. The archbishop stayed in his palace.

THE IMPRESS OF THE HOLY TRINITY

By THE BISHOP OF SOUTHAMPTON

THE attempt to bring the revealed mystery of the Blessed Trinity within the range of human understanding must have recourse to an examination of the Scriptural evidence, and the use both of reason and of that knowledge¹ of reality which transcends reason and is vouchsafed to the poet and the mystic. The empirical approach through Scripture must control the others, and the rational approach cannot ignore the testimony of the Bible. It was the glory of the Greek Fathers to bring the clarity and subtlety of Greek thinking to the apprehension of the mystery, and though they did not always give full weight to the Hebraism of the Bible their achievement stands as the indispensable frame for all contemplation of God as he is revealed in Scripture. The rational approach is admittedly as much liable to be tainted by the sinfulness and frailty of the creature as the empirical or the mystical, and it is only with prayer for penitence, humility, and godly fear that any attempt to explore the truth of God can be made. But given the evidence of Scripture and the use of reason as far as they will take us, and the metaphysical skeleton which is thus laid bare, the cold and lifeless skeleton will be restored to life by prayer and poetry. For the picture symbols of mystical experience are attempts to invent a language for a reality which cannot be apprehended by the study of Scripture and the use of reason alone. Such an approach will evoke the wonder of the mystery and so unfold some of the inexhaustible depths of its meaning. And this is wholly right and necessary so long as the imagery is consistent with the evidence, with rational description and

¹ For an examination of this sort of knowledge see Henri Brémond : *Prayer and Poetry*.

with experience in prayer, and not merely a flight of fancy. For the fact of the Holy Trinity is not merely a metaphysical truth, it is a Gospel which challenges faith and awakes adoration.

The imagery which has been employed is drawn from three sources, namely natural phenomena, the human personality, and social relationships. An example of the first is that of a river which, though one river, has its origin in a spring, its manifestation in a pool, and its movement in the stream, each of these being distinct from the other though they all make one river. Or, using the metaphor of light, "There is one mingling of light, as it were of three suns joined together."

All attempts to apprehend the nature of the divine being by reference to a threefold constitution of human nature are examples of the second kind. So St. Augustine speaks of *Memoria*, *Intelligentia*, and *Voluntas* or Amor; and St. Thomas Aquinas says that God is at one and the same time Power or Cause (Father), Wisdom (Son), and Will (Holy Ghost). The modern version of this triad is most commonly given as Thought, Feeling and Will, which in a human being are distinct activities interpermeating one another.

The imagery of social relationship appears in St. Augustine's trinity of lover, beloved, and the love which binds them, though this image makes the Holy Spirit a relation between the Father and the Son, and it is hard to see how a relation can be a "Person." But elsewhere he insists on the Personality of the Holy Spirit and so hints at, without explicitly endorsing, a social relationship of Persons. In Anglican Theology a statement of Bishop George Bull is unmistakable in its social reference: "Since God must be thought of as having self-sufficiency and most perfect bliss and happiness in himself alone, before and without all created beings . . . it plainly appears that himself alone is a most perfect and blessed society, the Father, the Son, and the Spirit eternally conversing with, and enjoying one another."

There are two classes into which those who try to describe spiritual experience are divided—those who use personal sym-

bols—father, lover, friend ; and those who use abstract symbols, usually derived from nature. There will always therefore be those who use sub-personal images to illuminate supra-personal reality. Between those who use the symbol of a threefold constitution of human personality and those who use the analogy of personal relationship there is no need to make an either-or choice. Theologians disagree and it is not my purpose to enter into argument upon the subject. Granted that the unity of God and the “personal” distinctness of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are alike to be safeguarded, and granted that we are in any case in the realm of suggestion and analogy, we need not take sides. Both serve a purpose, the analogy of the individual personality suggesting the unity, the analogy of social relationship the distinctions within the unity. It would certainly be foolish wholly to abandon the social analogy as misleading and false, partly because it is thoroughly Scriptural, partly because it supplies the most satisfying motive for Christian unity, and partly because, as I shall hope to show, it has highly suggestive social implications. For substantiation of these statements one only has to refer to the seventeenth chapter of St. John.

Dr. Tillyard in *The Elizabethan World Picture* shows by a galaxy of fascinating illustrations the vision of Order which inspired and regulated the lives of the Elizabethans, a vision reflected in Shakespeare and Hooker, Ben Jonson and Raleigh, as well as the lesser lights of that epoch. It was commonly believed that the Celestial Order influences and controls man’s disorders and the disorders of nature which were held to be consequent upon man’s sin. The content of Celestial Order was conceived to be rich and complex. First, and at the apex, there is God, all-powerful and all-controlling, and beneath his sway the eternal and immutable heavens were peopled with hierarchies of angelic orders ; and beneath them again

The Heavens themselves, the planets, and this centre
Observe degree, priority, and place,
Insisture, course, proportion, season, form,
Office and custom, in all line of order.

(*Troilus and Cressida*)

The stars were believed to sway men's destinies without robbing them of their responsibility of choice.

By contrast to the mutability of creation was the Divine Stability and rest :

Then gin I think on that which Nature said
Of that same time when no more change shall be,
But stedfast rest of all things, firmly stayed
Upon the pillars of eternity,
That is contrare to mutability.
For all that moveth doth in change delight :
But henceforth all shall rest eternally
With him that is the God of Sabaoth hight.
O, that great Sabaoth God, grant me that Sabbath's sight.
(Spenser)

The chain of being was "a metaphor which served to express the unimaginable plenitude of God's creation, its unfaltering order, and its ultimate unity. The chain stretched from the foot of God's throne to the meanest of inanimate objects." (Tillyard, 23).

There are correspondences between cosmic order, the body-politic, and the make-up of the individual, and an echo of St. Augustine's analogy of the Trinity, in the following poem quoted by Dr. Tillyard :

For as we hold there's but one God alone
But yet three persons in the Deity :
So the soul's parted, though in substance one,
Into understanding, will, and memory.
These powers of persons make one Trinity,
Yet but one substance indivisible ;
Which perfect trinity in unity,
Both being spiritual and invisible,
Do make the soul her God so right resemble.

And like as one true God in persons three
Doth rightly rule this great world's monarchy,
So in man's little world these virtues be
But one soul ruling it continually.
Yet in the lesser world, as well we try,
Be sundry sorts of people ; some there are
That be as head, some rulers are so high,

Some common citizens ; and some, less rare,
 Those rurals be that still are out of square.
 The heads are those above-recited three,
 The under-ruling thoughts and fancies are,
 The citizens the outward senses be,
 The rurals be the bodies rare
 (Which often make the soul most poor and bare) ;
 For when these riff-raffs in commotion live,
 And all will have their will, or nought will spare,
 The soul, poor soul, they then in rage surprise,
 And rob her of her wealth, and blind her of her eyes.
 (Davies of Hereford).

The idea of "Order in motion" appears in the cosmic dance. Milton describes the angels and the saints dancing in heaven, and the idea is worked out in Sir John Davies's poem with the significant title *Orchestra* wherein it is indeed "Love that makes the world go round."

Dancing, bright lady, then began to be,
 When the first seeds whereof the world did spring,
 The fire, air, earth, and water, did agree
 By Love's persuasion, nature's mighty king,
 To leave their first discorded combating,
 And in a dance such measure to observe,
 As all the world their motion should preserve.

Lastly it must never be forgotten that included in the Elizabethan pattern was the Christian scheme of salvation, Creation, the Fall, the Incarnation, the Atonement, and Resurrection in Christ.

This conception of the heavenly order, so rich, and so inspiring and controlling, was greater than the frame in which it was set. This frame was a limited if not wholly erroneous scientific knowledge, the Ptolemaic astronomy, and a carefully graded order of society, itself the elaboration of feudalism.

The same poem of Sir John Davies, *Orchestra*, published in 1596, already adumbrates the revolution in thought which Copernicus's discovery was bound to create :

Only the earth doth stand for ever still :
Her rocks remove not, nor her mountains meet,
(Although some wits enriched with learning's skill
Say heaven stands firm and that the earth doth fleet,
And swiftly turneth underneath their feet).

The idea of "degree" in society has been attacked by levellers of many kinds since the days of Queen Elizabeth, and all earlier attempts to obliterate it are being outpaced by the furious energy of Communists in our own day.

The natural order is no longer the symbol of stability it used to be as it becomes increasingly unaccountable and mysterious to the scientific philosopher. We cannot therefore argue so confidently from order in nature to order in God as Sir Walter Raleigh. We have in fact largely lost the old controlling pattern, and have had bitter experience of the resulting disorder, disaster, and chaos. But in the work of rebuilding, some of the old materials can be incorporated into the new structure. Scholars, for example, have patiently dug out afresh from the Scriptures the content of the Apostolic Preaching, the *Kerugma*, the Message Proclaimed, the Christian Scheme, and it remains the same pattern which impressed itself upon the Elizabethans. The pattern which they took for granted and modern scholars endorse still effectively impresses itself upon human societies of all kinds, wherever the Gospel is faithfully proclaimed.²

Even though we can no longer believe in the influence of the stars on human affairs there is no need to doubt the divine impress upon creation or the fact that we are "Partakers of the Divine Nature." Nor can we ignore or throw over the fact and necessity of order alike in nature and society. The astonishing discoveries of science simply could not have happened unless there is order actually there in the universe, and not merely a desire of researching minds to find it or a capacity on their part to impress it upon phenomena. Rank and degree have always found a place in human society, and the idea of degree has been

² cf. Godfrey Phillips : *The Transmission of the Faith*.

proved in the Elizabethan age to be consistent with a high estimate of the dignity of man, and the notion of "higher" and "lower," "superior" and "inferior" is not easily eradicated either from the realm of nature or from social relationships. There is an honourable "ladder of perfection" and a desire for advancement which is legitimate. But W. S. Gilbert's delicious play with the monarch turned republican in the *Gondoliers* seems to confuse "order" and "degree."

The Chancellor in his peruke—
 The Earl, the Marquis, and the Dook—
 The Groom, the Butler, and the Cook—
 They all shall equal be.

Lord Chancellors were cheap as sprats,
 And Bishops in their shovel hats
 Were plentiful as tabby cats—
 In point of fact too many.

* * *

The end is easily foretold
 When every blessed thing you hold
 Is made of silver or of gold
 You long for simple pewter.

In short, whoever you may be,
 To this conclusion you'll agree,
 When everyone is somebodee,
 Then no-one's anybody !

Degree may be necessary in a fallen world, but order is a divine pattern. There is order, but not degree, in God. The introduction of the idea of degree into Godhead is the trap into which the heretics fall. Scripture is permeated with the idea of order (*ταξις, τασσω* and its compounds), but takes little account of degree. Order and coinherence go together, but not coinherence and degree ("I have called you friends," "The servant knoweth not what his lord doeth"). Coinherence between God and man is possible only because man in Christ is given adopted sonship. There are many sayings of our Lord which are hard upon degree. Reward is not for merit but is the gift of God. 'Many that are first shall be last and the last first. The riches of the rich fool are of no account in the hour

of judgement. The social climber is warned in the saying about the lowest place at feasts. The same strain is to be found in the Magnificat and St. James's Epistle. The danger of degree is that it ministers to man's snobbery and self-esteem, and concern for his reputation. It may be that degree should be eliminated from society, but part of our present trouble is that those who are so eager to abolish degree are in danger of stamping out order also and putting regimentation in its place. Yet order remains a necessity of any kind of life that can be called civilized. Order is fundamental to society.

The idea behind the Elizabethan "chain of being" is by us more congenially expressed as interdependence or interpermeation or coinherence, all creation possessing recognizable distinctnesses, yet mysteriously belonging together because, though utterly distinct from its Creator, it is permeated by his divine life and energy, which is radiated from the centre outwards.

The cosmic dance declares itself in a guise even more amazing than that dreamt of by the Elizabethans—that of the furious whirling of the electrons ; and of the other end of the scale of being C. S. Lewis can say : " In Christianity God is not a static *thing*—not even a person, but a dynamic, pulsating activity, a life, almost a kind of drama. Almost, if you won't think me irreverent, a kind of dance . . . The whole dance or drama or pattern of this three-Personal life is to be played out in each one of us ; or (putting it the other way round) each one of us has got to enter that pattern, take his place in that dance."

There are hints here of the pattern which men are searching for such as can curb man's disorder and fulfil God's design. It is a pattern which must embrace the Christian scheme of creation and redemption, and which is at once orderly and dynamic both in itself and in its impress upon creation. By its quality of holiness and integration it must provide the ground for the ordering of human relationships : and by its righteousness it must press to judgement the issues of right and wrong.

Professor Collingwood, at the end of his book *The Idea of Nature*, suggests that the idea of nature depends upon the idea

of history. "Natural Science," he says, "as a form of thought exists and always has existed in a context of history, and depends on historical thought for its existence. From this I venture to infer that no one can understand natural science unless he understands history : and that no one can answer the question what nature is unless he knows what history is." If this is true it means that the study of nature will lose its way unless and until it acknowledges its relatedness to the study of history : and that means that the pattern we are seeking cannot be in the realm of abstract principle but must be embedded in the concrete of history. It must also be congenial to a society which is moving on the whole rightly in the direction of equality.

Lastly we need a pattern which can guide and control human interdependence and lift economic interdependence up to the level of social and political interdependence, a pattern which will develop our membership one of another and at the same time resist the collectivism which ignores individuality.

In the mystery of the blessed Trinity such a pattern is to be discerned. It is a pattern which gathers up and enshrines the acts of the Living God in creation and redemption. It is a historic revelation bound up as it is with the historic Incarnation of the Son of God ; and that Incarnation is itself the clue to the understanding of history. It is no lifeless form, but full of the dynamic energy of love which by its very nature impresses itself upon creation ; a pattern not below personality but beyond it. It is a pattern of holiness and righteousness not as abstract qualities but as concrete creative Reality, and therefore provides the sources and inspiration of all moral and social relationships. It declares that equality of being can exist consistently with differentiation of Order and activity. And it is the pattern of coinherence from which all our membership one of another is derived.

The definition of coinherence was the last definition about the Trinity to be reached in the Patristic age,³ and this is to be

³ See Prestige : *God in Patristic Thought*.

expected seeing that it requires for its apprehension so many other elements of truth about God. Coinherence requires "Persons" and a distinction of "Persons" at once other than each other and mutually indwelling. Nor can there be full and perfect coinherence within the Godhead unless God is One ("that they may be one *as We are*"). "The unity exists by reason of a principle of constructive integration which the Godhead essentially possesses."⁴ The Persons are not to be confounded nor the substance divided. This mutuality depends upon equality. "In this Trinity none is afore or after other : none is greater or less than another, but the whole three Persons are co-eternal together and co-equal."

Yet God the Father is the sole Source and Fount of Deity, from which the Son and the Holy Ghost from all eternity derive their being. "The Father is made of none : neither created nor begotten. The Son is of the Father alone, not made nor created but begotten. The Holy Ghost is of the Father and the Son, neither made nor created nor begotten but proceeding."

These truths are expressed in the technical terms *monarchia* and *subordination* and each requires careful safeguarding from erroneous use. It is the literal meaning of the word *monarchy* (sole source) which must be kept in mind, not the associations such as despotism or hereditariness which have gathered round it in connexion with human kingship. The underlying thought is of monotheism by contrast to polytheism, of unity of authority and command as distinct from divided counsels or rival powers. Sole authority may be exercised through many. "I maintain," says Tertullian, "that no authority is so exclusively personal or individual or in such sense a monarchy, that it is incapable of being exercised through other proximate persons." He might have added, had he lived today, that the word "monarchy" in this technical sense can be as suitably applied to an elected President or Parliament as to a hereditary Ruler.

⁴ Prestige on Tertullian, *ib.* 99.

When the Son is spoken of as *subordinate* to the Father there need be no suggestion that he is a lesser god (that is the heresy of *subordinationism*) or that he is lesser in importance than the Father. There is no degree in the being of God. It means that the Father glorifies the Son by sustaining him in his perfect obedience, and the Son glorifies the Father by the perfection of his obedience. It means that the Father sends and the Son is sent, on terms not of superiority and inferiority, but of equality. The Son is not only obedient to the Father in his Incarnate Life ; filial subordination is a feature of the eternal relations of the Son to the Father. Voluntary and rational obedience is not a sign of inferiority of nature.

Coinherence is primarily that of the Persons in the one Godhead with each other :

When heaven and earth were yet unmade,
When time was yet unknown ;
Thou in Thy bliss and majesty
Didst live and love alone.

But this coinherence of the Divine Being reaches out according to the Divine Pleasure, to embrace the whole creation. So we address the Holy Spirit in prayer :

As Thou dost join with holiest bonds
The Father and the Son,
So fill Thy saints with mutual love
And link their hearts in one.

God is Love : God so loved the world that he sent his Son . . . that the love wherewith thou lovedst me may be in them . . . Beloved, if God so loved us we ought also to love one another.

God by the operation of his love, reaching out from the love eternally active in the Godhead itself, impresses the structure of his Triune Being (*χαρακτηρ*) upon what he made, so that we may expect to find the pattern of the Trinity reflected, however faintly, in human society. To give three examples :

(1) the Order which is fundamental to society is the impress of the Divine Nature upon it, for the components of Order

are "monarchy," subordination and coinherence. (2) Wherever we find true community by contrast to unbridled individualism on the one hand and mere gregariousness or collectivism on the other, where, that is, distinctness of persons is combined with essential unity, where there is bearing of one another's burdens and speaking the truth in love, there is the impress of the Life of the Trinity. (3) Where there is unity of authority in government together with free and willing obedience offered to the governors by the governed, on the basis of equality under God, there is the impress of the *monarchia*—subordination relationship in the Blessed Trinity. The pattern of all right subordination to authority is the subordination of the Son to the Father. On the contrary we can reasonably affirm that where the principles of coinherence, *monarchia* and subordination are violated there will be found disorder, bad government, and slavery.

Christians are to be one as the Persons in the Trinity are one. "The Christian doctrine of God contains an assertion about the nature of unity. It asserts that all the actual unities of our earthly experience, from the unity of a hydrogen atom to the unity of a work of art, of the human self, or of a human society, are imperfect instances of what unity truly is. We may find in them analogies to that true unity, and learn from them something of what perfect unity must be. But perfect unity itself is to be found only in God, and it is through the revelation of God in Christ that we find the unity of God to be of such a kind as to cast light upon our lesser unities. Thus the Christian revelation brings with it a contribution to human thought on the subject of unity, a contribution which theologians and philosophers have not always rightly appreciated either as a matter of historical fact or as a source of enlightenment."⁵

The love of God cannot be confined. It reaches as freely and generously to the most benighted heathen as to the most beloved disciple. And yet he is pleased also to wait upon man's

⁵ Hodgson : *Doctrine of the Trinity*, p. 96.

response and therefore to work outwards through those who respond to those who do not yet do so. So it is that the seventeenth chapter of St. John envisages love reaching out from the heart of the Godhead, first to the apostolic band, and thence to those who believe through their word ; and in each case the indispensable condition of the overflow or permeating radiation of love from God to the apostolic band, and from the apostles to the Church and from the Church to the world, is the existence of love in the Being of God, in the being of the apostolate, in the being of the Church.

But we are leaving out an essential step in the progress to unity according to the mind of our Lord as expressed in St. John xvii unless we recognize that the first part of the prayer (verses 6-19) is a prayer for unity in the apostolic band. They are to be one as the Father and the Son are One. "This unity is the love of God possessing the hearts of men so as to unite them in itself—as the Father and the Son are united in that love of each for each which is the Holy Ghost. The unity which the Lord prays that his disciples may enjoy is that which is eternally characteristic of the Triune God."⁶ It may therefore be expected to bear the impress of the Trinity, and the condition of the unity of the Church is the unity of the apostolic band in this sense.

First we may notice that the apostolic ministry is Holy Order and that the components of order are to be found in the apostolic band. We read of a quarrel⁷ breaking out among the apostles more than once in the days immediately before the Crucifixion, and the fact that it was repeated even at the Last Supper gives poignancy to the Master's prayer at the conclusion of the supper that they might be one. It was a quarrel as to who was to take the lead. "There arose a reasoning among them who should be greatest." This may be connected with John's report : "Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy Name, and we forbade him." John was an impetuous and

⁶ W. Temple : *Readings in St. John's Gospel*, comment on John xvii, 11.

⁷ See Broomfield : *John, Peter and the Fourth Gospel*.

ambitious young man, and seems to have set himself up as a rival in leadership, for he was apparently speaking for more than himself; and Peter may well have rebuked him on behalf of the rest, for when James and John asked for the chief places in the Kingdom we are told that the ten were moved with indignation, presumably because they recognized in Peter their appointed leader. And Peter had evidently been provoked many times : " Lord, how often shall my brother sin against me and I forgive him ? Until seven times ? " This quarrel drew from our Lord the saying about the lordship of the kings of the Gentiles. " But ye shall not be so : but he that is the greater among you, let him become as the younger : and he that is the chief, as he that is a deacon. I am in the midst of you as a deacon." The Crucifixion and Resurrection and Pentecost wrought such a change in the apostolic body that we subsequently find between Peter and John harmony and order based on *monarchia* and subordination on the basis of equality, and coinherence rooted in mutual forgiveness and bearing of each others' burdens. Order is here seen to be the working of judgement and forgiving love (binding and loosing) within the frame of authority and obedience.

It is tempting to associate the fact that we believe the threefold character of the ministry to be divinely intended with the divine Tri-unity. The evidence for any such association comes in patristic literature only from Ignatius and the author of the *Didascalia*, who was evidently influenced in what he says by Ignatius. Ignatius says, " Be zealous to do all things in harmony with God, with the bishop in the place of God, and the presbyters in the place of the Council of the Apostles, and the deacons, who are most dear to me, entrusted with the diaconate of Jesus Christ, who was from eternity with the Father and was made manifest at the end of time." (*Magn.* 6,1). And again : " Let all respect the deacons as Jesus Christ, even as the bishop is the type of the Father, and the presbyters as the Council of God and the College of the Apostles." (*Trall.* 3, 1.)

The *Didascalia* repeats the same analogy, adding : " And the deaconess shall be honoured by you in place of the Holy Spirit," such language being no doubt explained by the fact that " Spirit " is feminine in gender in the Semitic group of languages.

It may be said that the analogy is fanciful and that there is no solid backing in theology for the extravagances of the overwrought prophet and martyr-to-be. But it must be remembered that neither the doctrine of the Trinity nor of the Holy Spirit had taken a coherent shape at the time that Ignatius wrote his letters ; that the differentiation between bishops and presbyters had not yet been defined, and though the deacons knew that their function was to attend upon the bishops and to act in the Liturgy as the go-betweens for the bishop as celebrant and the congregation, there was little if any doctrine of the diaconate.

If we think in terms only of analogy anyone is at liberty to say that the particular analogy between the Trinity and the ministry is a false analogy, but if following St. John xvii we think of the radiating impress of the divine character upon creation, and if we are right in submitting that Order is made up of *monarchia*, subordination, and coinherence, then two things follow. First, the impress of divinity upon creatures is real, but it must never be forgotten that it is made upon creatures who, even though their robes be washed white in the blood of the Lamb, are creatures still, still, while they are on earth, sinners and compassed about with the infirmities of creatureliness and original sin ; and therefore the impress is bound to be imperfect and distorted ; and because of man's fallen nature there will be some admixture of degree with order. Though there is no degree in God some degree is admissible in the Order of the ministry as a concession to human weakness. Secondly, as the divine impress radiates characteristically through the ministry to the Church and through the Church to the world, the nearest impress of the Trinity upon creation is likely to be that on Holy Order. The fact that according to Ignatius presbyters are a type of the Council of the Apostles

and deacons of Jesus Christ can be explained by the fact that Jesus himself said "I am among you as a deacon," and that the distinction of the order of priesthood from that of episcopacy was not yet clear to the mind of the Church.

It is a fact now commonly accepted that ministerial priesthood is derived from the High Priesthood of our Lord, and the Epistle to the Hebrews and books like Moberly's *Ministerial Priesthood* amply bear witness to the fact. And the work of the Holy Spirit as Paraclete, his self-effacement, his work as point of contact, the fact that "through the Spirit we mount up to the Son, and through the Son to the Father" (Irenaeus)—all this is consistent with the character of diaconate.

The doctrines of *monarchia*, subordination, and coinherence coincide at many points with and illuminate at others the Catholic doctrine of the ministry and suggest how that doctrine might be brought to a greater fullness which would enable us to see how far short all ministries fall of the glory of God. As the ministry is the free gift of the Father to the Son ("Thine they were and thou gavest them to me," John xvii, 6), so in the bishop's *Accipe curam meam et tuam* the cure of souls is deemed to be his gift to the priest. The people are the bishop's people and he makes a present of them to the priest.

As God is One in three "Persons," so the ministry is one in three orders. Those who claim "parity of ministers" are right in claiming that the ministry is one and that in the mind of God no one of the three orders is superior or inferior to the others; but wrong in asserting that the orders of bishop, priest and deacon are distinct only in function and not in being. To confuse the orders is in fact analogous to the Sabelian heresy of "confounding the Persons."

The fact that the ministry is both representative, so that Ignatius can say (*Eph.* 1, 3) "I received in the name of God your whole congregation in the person of Onesimus, a man of inexpressible love and your bishop," and also of divine appointment to the Church, reflects the fact that God is both immanent and transcendent.

As the doctrine of subordination is reflected in the oath of canonical obedience, so the doctrine of *monarchia* coincides with the Catholic doctrine of episcopacy. As the Father is the sole fount of deity from which the Son is begotten and the Spirit proceeding, so to the bishop is committed authority to ordain priests and deacons, his being the essential ministry from which the others are derived. The principle of *monarchia* is necessary to the government of the Church and a primacy *inter pares* is the rational way of giving expression to the principle. But what is said above about the divine impress being inevitably distorted in its incidence upon creatures by reason of the fallen-ness of creation makes it impossible for those outside the Roman allegiance to accept Papal Infallibility.

As there is coinherence in the life of the Blessed Trinity so must there be not only within each separate order of the ministry, but between the orders, a mutuality of love and understanding, a bearing of the burdens of each order on behalf of the others. As each member of the Blessed Trinity is distinct in being and function and yet exercises a mysterious exchange of functions, the Son ruling, the Spirit being asked to direct and rule our hearts, the Son and the Spirit creating, as well as the Father, so the priest never ceases to be a deacon, nor the bishop a priest and a deacon, and the priest exercises at least some of the functions of the bishops in rule and pastoral care.

Seeing that the coinherence of the ministry is derived from and sustained by the coinherence of the Trinity, there will always be a godward and a manward movement in all ministry, the minister looking to God in penitence, adoration, prayer and obedience as to the source and fount of love, and then sharing the love so received with others ; for as the Love that is the Being of God overflows and impresses itself upon creation, so the ministry is to be forthgoing in love to the Church and through the Church to the world.

I conclude with an attempt to gather together some of the lines of thought which emerge from this meditation upon the mystery of the divine Being and its impress upon creation :

1. Society needs order, not merely as a static scaffolding, but as a living and personal impress, and we find the pattern of it in the Order of the Blessed Trinity.
 2. Order in a sinful world is associated with degree. Those who are working to abolish degree are right if they know what they are doing. But degree will never be abolished by decree or regulation or economic pressure ; but only by the eradication of sin. Unless people realize this they are in danger of throwing out order in their attempt to abolish degree.
 3. There appears to be an organic connexion between order in society and Holy Order, which may have sociological significance. Holy Order is not a caste. It should be a foretaste and pattern of order of a wider character.
 4. The unity and fellowship of the ministry is important as a condition of the unity of the Church.
 5. This line of thought seems to throw fresh light on the problems of Church Order which perplex and divide those who are working for Christian unity.
- E.G. (i) It suggests that the distinctions in the ministry belong to the realm of order and not of function, and checks the tendency to overstress the administrative and utilitarian aspects of the ministry. Doing is the fruit of Being.
- (ii) It gives a clearer vision of the nature of each order in the ministry and of their mutual relations.
 - (iii) It clarifies the nature of hierarchy and disentangles it from feudal and secular associations.
 - (iv) It shows the true character of *monarchia* and subordination in the government of the Church.
 - (v) It throws light on the doctrine of "parity of ministers," and suggests that the flaw in non-episcopal ministries has to do with "confounding the Orders."

BERAKAH AND EUCHARISTIA¹

By R. D. RICHARDSON

Principal of Ripon Hall, Oxford.

That the Last Supper was not the Passover meal itself is now generally recognized ; partly because the Marcan account of it as such is seen to be an interpretation of what actually happened, partly because the Fourth Gospel assigns the Supper to the day before the feast and the Eastern Church has preserved this tradition in its eucharistic practice.² Apart from Mark's bare statements, two of them confusing the Passover with the Feast of Unleavened Bread,³ there is nothing to identify the meal as the Passover supper ; the description of it is in fact at variance with all Paschal customs, except for the mention of a closing hymn, which could represent the *hallel*.

Equally is it now recognized that the Last Supper cannot be identified with any other Jewish meal at which a *kiddûsh*, or "sanctification of the day", is pronounced over a cup of wine ; for this ceremony is confined to festivals. A suggestion that on this occasion the *kiddûsh*-cup was drunk on the Thursday,⁴ the "day of Preparation" for the sabbath, because the sabbath observance itself was superseded by the major feast, is not sup-

¹This essay represents one section of a work on eucharistic origins, the publication of which, together with Miss D. H. G. Reeve's translation of Lietzmann's *Messe und Herrenmahl*, has long been delayed on account of present printing costs.

²Cf. Lietzmann, *Messe und Herrenmahl* (1926), p. 211; W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Jewish Background*, stated the case independently, if less fully, about the same time.

³Mark xiv, 1, 12; cf. Numbers xxviii, 16, Leviticus xxiii, 5 f.

⁴W. O. E. Oesterley, *op. cit.*, p. 172 ff. My own inquiries support those of F. L. Cirlot, *The Early Eucharist*, p. 8 f.

ported by any known instance of this in history and is regarded as incredible by Jewish scholars.

There remains for closer examination the theory that the Last Supper was a *habûrah*-meal. Christian liturgists were led to this theory by references to the fellowship-meals of Jews in various studies of the origins of Pharisaism and later Judaism made during the last century by Hebrew scholars, among whom Abraham Geiger and Ismar Elbogen are the most widely known. But Elbogen's *Der jüdische Gottesdienst* (1913) is based entirely on the Talmud, and the author himself calls attention to the paucity and lateness of the evidence for Jewish customs in earlier times. Likewise Geiger's *Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel* (1857) draws only on the Talmud for the little that it tells us of Jewish meals, while its broad use of the word *habûrah* as seen in such an expression as "*Diese Genossenschaften, σσσοῖτια, habûrôth*",⁵ seems to have been insufficiently regarded. Lietzmann is carried beyond the evidence when he translates *habûrah* without reserve as "cult-fellowship" and describes a *habûrah*-meal as one that was "invested with religious solemnity";⁶ Oesterley is misleading when he says that "*habûrah* means fellowship—almost love".⁷ The word means simply an association, group, party or band; that it signifies a religious company in particular seems primarily to have been deduced from the fact that it occurs in *Berakôth*, a tractate of the Mishnah. There it is used, although in one passage only, in the directions on how "companies" are to be divided into multiples of three or ten for the saying of grace after meals;⁸ but Jewish scholars attach to it no religious significance. In any case the choice of numbers only appears to constitute a company for the saying of grace; whilst the saying of grace itself does not necessarily give a more specifically re-

⁵ A. Geiger, *Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer Abhängigkeit v. d. inneren Entwicklung des Judentums*, p. 123 f.

⁶ *Messe und Herrenmahl*, pp. 204, 210.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 204.

⁸ *Mish*, vii, 5 (3); cf. H. Danby's excellent translation.

ligious character to a meal than a benediction bestows upon a modern Corporation banquet. In such a light, then, must we estimate the following statement made by Oesterley: "There was a distinctly religious atmosphere about these gatherings (of *habûrôth*); religious topics were of paramount interest to the Jews, hence the subjects of conversation on these occasions were of a religious character".⁹ This may, or may not, have been so, but it does not make the word *habûrah* mean a religious assembly; the word could also be applied to a social or academic gathering; indeed, in Rabbinic phraseology, any party of people taking a meal together forms a *habûrah*.

Oesterley confines the *habûrah*-meal to a "social, quasi-religious meal" which began "fairly early in the afternoon" of Fridays and was continued until dusk, when it passed into a specifically religious observance by the act of the president who "took a cup of wine and said a benediction over it for 'the sanctification of the day'." The *habûrah*-meal theory thus made its entrance into English liturgical studies only as a variant of the theory that the Last Supper was one at which 2 *kiddûsh*-cup was drunk; yet, although the latter theory is now rejected, Oesterley's suggestion that Jesus and his disciples "constituted a *habûrah*" (translated as religious fellowship) has won acceptance and been used as a basis for further deductions. The only evidence adduced for it by Oesterley himself is John xv, 14, "Ye are my friends", *φίλοι*, the Jewish equivalent of which word is more likely to be *yedidai*¹⁰ than *haberim*. F. L. Cirlot, in acknowledged dependence upon Oesterley, goes on to say: "We have no proof, nor is it likely, that these *haburôth* would rigidly limit themselves to holding a social meal on those occasions when a *kiddûsh* would be in order. Certainly . . . Jesus and his disciples could hardly have done so . . . Hence we should expect *a priori* that (the Last Supper held on a Thursday) would conform to the type of meal de-

⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 167.

¹⁰ Prof. D. C. Simpson points out to me that this is the rendering given by Delitzsch in his translation of the New Testament into Biblical Hebrew for the British and Foreign Bible Society.

scribed (in Berakôth) as the more solemn and formal type of *habûrah*-banquet" which concluded with a common cup of blessing.¹¹ The hypothesis has been carried a stage further still by Gregory Dix, who, confessedly relying chiefly not only on Oesterley but now also on Cirlot, lays it down that "*habûrôth* were little private groups or informal societies of friends banded together (within the ordinary Jewish congregations) for purposes of special devotion and charity . . . much like the original 'Methodist' societies within the Church of England . . . The corporate meeting of a *habûrah* regularly took the form of a weekly supper, generally held on the eve of sabbaths or holy days, though there was no absolute rule about this"! In these ways, then, has hypothesis finally been resolved into statements of apparent fact. It is true that Gregory Dix, in a footnote to the above quotation, mentions that the existence of religious *habûrôth* in the first century is disputed; but his book proceeds magisterially on the assumption that they did exist, that the Last Supper was a *habûrah*-meal of Jesus and his disciples, and that it conformed to "the formality and exactness" "well-known to us from Rabbinic sources" as governing the customs of such suppers "in a pious Jewish household".¹²

On this basis, Gregory Dix gives an account of the Last Supper which conflates the various New Testament records of it and harmonizes it with the miscellaneous directions for meals contained in the Mishnah. Thus in his reconstruction the cup of the shorter text of Luke is regarded as part of the relishes taken before a formal Jewish banquet began; the blessing of the bread is said to be the ordinary grace before meals prescribed by Berakôth, the bread-words and formula of remembrance being pronounced by Jesus immediately afterwards; the discourses of the Fourth Gospel are placed during the meal, and then, when the meal is over, instead of the prescribed rinsing of hands by an attendant, Jesus washes the disciples'

¹¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 15.

¹² *The Shape of The Liturgy*, pp. 50 f.

feet ; the cup is described as " the cup of blessing " with which a formal Jewish meal ends, and the thanksgiving over it as the grace prescribed on such an occasion ; a dialogue to which the disciples " intoned their responses " is said to have preceded this grace, the grace itself being " chanted " by Jesus, who then pronounced the wine-words and the second formula of remembrance ; finally a psalm, which was not the *hallel*, was sung.¹³ Further, the two graces (quoted from the Jewish prayer book now in use, as not likely to have altered substantially even since before the time of Jesus) are described as " blessings of ' the Name ' of God which released the food of the *habûrah* for its consumption ", an idea " intimately connected " with the " primitive usage of the word epiclesis in connexion with the eucharist " ;¹⁴ and the series of thanksgivings in the final grace (for creation, deliverance, the covenant, " the food wherewith thou dost continually feed us "), preceded by a " naming " of God and concluding with a " glorifying of the Name ", is said to have provided the scheme of the original eucharistia, i.e. before that second half of the prayer (so variable in the earliest liturgies), which is introduced by a reference to the Last Supper, was added.¹⁵

In criticism of this theory of eucharistic origins we have observed already that the term *habûrah* possesses in Hebrew a wider meaning than that of a specifically religious company. But what of companies or associations formed for specifically religious purposes ? From earliest historical times such companies existed, whether of a temporary or a permanent character, e.g. religious meals, i.e. sacrifices, were eaten by companies ; but the company was the clan, *mishpachah*.¹⁶ In Homer the equivalent for clan is *φρῆτηρ*,¹⁷ and this is the word used by Josephus in the form *φρατρία*, with modified meaning, when

¹³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 50 ff

¹⁴ p. 274 f.

¹⁵ pp. 214 ff.

¹⁶ *Cf.* I Samuel xx. 6, 29.

¹⁷ See W. M. Ramsay, *Asiatic Elements in Greek Civilization*, p. 204.

he says that the number of "a company to every sacrifice" (i.e. of one Paschal Lamb) is "not less than ten, and many of us are twenty in a company".¹⁸ In this modified sense of the word, *qoatqia* would probably best be rendered in neo-Hebrew by *habûrah*;¹⁹ but even so, this is but another example of the use of *habûrah* to describe a company of people, not necessarily assembled *qua* religious people.

We turn to the Jewish religious sect called the Essenes, first mentioned about 150 B.C. ; and Philo, who says that they were four thousand strong (Josephus classes them with the Pharisees and Sadducees in importance and numbers the former at only six thousand), describes them as living in companies under a president (*προσετώς*, the word used also by Justin of the president of the Christian eucharist). As a religious sect, they were governed by ceremonial and charitable motives, and, for the rest, Josephus speaks of them as holding such doctrines as the immortality of souls. The Hellenic element in their practice, no doubt, as well as in their thought, is indicative of tendencies which spread throughout the Greek Synagogue, and from thence to Eastern Christianity ; and one cannot dismiss offhand the possibility that their religious meals, or others like them, exercised an influence, in some places at least, upon the Christian Supper. According to Philo, they bathed in cold water before eating and their food was of the simplest ; whether, like the Therapeutae, they did not drink wine, we do not know. Only the highest grade was admitted to the sacrifice of the common meals, at which bread was the most important element—the president or priest, as in the Nestorian-Persian, the Syrian-Jacobite and the Armenian Christian churches, being also the maker of the bread. Josephus mentions that the president said grace before and after meals : did this custom call for his notice because it was

¹⁸*B. J.* vi, 9, 3 ; cf. also *A. J.* iii, 10, 5.

¹⁹Cf. *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, p. 533 : "The lamb represented a *habûrah* (company) ; for single individuals it was not to be killed except in extraordinary cases."

unusual? If so, no formal graces such as are prescribed in Berakôth were yet in general use among the Jews; and although the religious life of the Essenes was lived essentially, as Philo says, "in companies", the word which he uses is *θιγαροίς*, a Hellenic term.²⁰

There remains for our consideration one other association of religious Jews. And first, in this connexion, we note that upon the so-called coins of the earlier Maccabees the word *habêr* appears in the designation of an aristocratic senate of the *hasidîm*, associated with the ruler in the government from about 196 B.C. until the breach of the party with Hyrcanus about 108 B.C.²¹ From this time onwards the word disappears from the coins; but already the name *haberîm*, companions, was being given by themselves to any Jews who undertook to be scrupulous in payment of their religious dues and in keeping free from ceremonial defilement. These companions formed a *habûrah*, association, in four grades, according to the strictness of their practice, the lowest and by far the most numerous of which were called Pherushim or Pharishaia, the Separated; separated, that is, from the 'Am-ha'aretz, the common or unclean.²² But the Pharisees, although their name originated in this way, were, historically, those whose chief concern was for a continuing and developing oral interpretation of the Torah; and in their hands Judaism ceased to be a priestly and a sacrificial religion. There was for them an unwritten Torah, a living Tradition, of absorbing interest as related to current questions, although it often had little connexion with the Law

²⁰ *Quod omnis probus liber.* § 12. ed. Mang, ii p. 457; Josephus, *B. J.*, ii. 8. 5; *Ant.* xiii. 5. 9, xviii. 1. 3; cf. Hippolytus, *Refut. Haeres.*, ix 15. cf. also Edersheim, *Life and Times*, p. 326 ff and J. F. Keating, *The Agape and the Eucharist*, p. 24 f.

²¹ Cf. also *I Macc.* xii. 6; xiii. 36; xiv. 28; *Jos. Ant.* xiii. 4. 9, 5. 8; 10. 5. 6; *Tal. b. Kidd.* 66a; also A. Geiger, *op. cit.*, pp. 121 ff and A. Edersheim, *Life and Times*, pp. 308 ff.

²² Cf. R. Travers Herford, *The Pharisees*; also Appendix E., by G. F. Moore, to Vol. I *The Beginnings of Christianity* (ed. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake).

of Moses which it claimed to interpret. And this growing body of precepts for the ordering of practical life (*halâkah*) and of lessons of every other kind drawn out from scripture for purposes of edification (*haggâdah*), was finally codified at the beginning of the third century in the Mishnah : so far as the regulating of table-customs is concerned, in that tractate of it which is called Berakôth. Thus, the only case in which we can speak of a *habûrah* in the sense of a religious institution is in relation to that historical association of Jews which came into being for purposes of stricter Levitical observance ; and the appeal to Berakôth for enlightenment as to the procedure at the Last Supper carries with it the implication that Jesus subscribed to the rules laid down by the Pharisees. But if the Gospels are any guide at all, Jesus must have belonged to the 'Am-ha'aretz—a class distinction based not on birth but on non-membership in the association of precisionists : he subjected the Law to private judgement and condemned the very first step which admitted one to this *habûrah*, i.e. the rule of ceremonial washing before meals,²³ even though he held some Pharisaic doctrines.

These things being so, the claim that table-procedure as described in Berakôth must substantially have been the same in Jesus' time does not touch our problem. Further, the claim itself cannot be made good, for the Mishnah has admittedly undergone redactions even since its compiler's day and was in the first place compiled only after a period of political upheavals, changes and confusions brought about by two rebellions and two Roman conquests.²⁴ After the Bar Cochba

²³ Cf. Mark vii, 2; Matthew xii, 25; Luke xi, 38. An aristocrat, a Sadducee, a High-Priest, might be of the 'Am-ha'aretz ; even Rabbi Aquiba, who began the garnering of the oral Tradition just before the final disappearance of the Jewish State in A.D. 135, was formerly of this class.

²⁴H. Danby, *The Mishnah*, pp. xxi, xvi, xiv.

revolt, "the city and the temple, the priests and the Sadducees, had gone, and with them also the ordinary life of the provincial towns and the villages".²⁵ Under such conditions, too much can be made of the admittedly conservative nature of ritual observances; while it would detract from the work of the great Rabbis of the second century to suppose that—deep though its roots are in the past—modern Judaism, which they created to be essentially a religion of the hearth and home, is almost identical in this respect with the Judaism practised while the Temple was still standing. The brief benedictions of *Berakôth*, to be said over different foods,²⁶ appear to represent the limit of definitely-worded table-forms reached by the year A.D. 200; no form of the "common grace" after meals is given, for it had as yet neither definite redaction nor general binding force.²⁷ These considerations being duly weighed, it cannot be a justifiable procedure to put the grace as we now know it, (even excepting its third, unquestionably late, paragraph) into the mouth of Jesus at the Last Supper and then attempt to reconstruct from it the earliest Christian eucharistia.

If *Berakôth* gives no proper form for the grace itself, it does however give very precise forms for the invitation of the host to say grace when the company numbers three, ten, a hundred, a thousand, etc.²⁸ On this basis the invitation to a hundred, "Let us bless (or give thanks to) our Lord God", which appears as a versicle in the eucharistic dialogue, is claimed by Gregory Dix both as further proof that the eucharistia derives from the Jewish grace and as proof that the eucharist itself was "an official and corporate action of the whole church."²⁹ But with regard to the first of these two points,

²⁵ A. L. Williams, *Berakôth*, p. xii.

²⁶ *Mish.* vi-ix; *Tos.* v-vii.

²⁷ Cf. *The Jewish Encyclopaedia*, pp. 187 f, for remarks on the fluid nature of benedictions. The first references to the wording of the final grace are found in the supplement to the *Mishnah* (*Tosephta* i. 7, v. 24), which, whatever its actual date, is at least later.

²⁸ vii. 3.

²⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 80.

the Christian response to this versicle is different from the Jewish response (when at length we find the latter in the Jewish liturgy), while the remainder of the dialogue has no Jewish parallels. With regard to the second point, this particular versicle appears only in the later Roman rite; the Greek rites give it in a form resembling the Jewish invitation to a company of ten only, "Let us bless our God". It is doubtful therefore if either of the points is well made. That the versicle, in both forms, is Jewish, there is no doubt; but it seems more likely that its presence in the dialogue is due to the general, later, Jewish influence so clearly traceable on Christian liturgical forms in the East, than that it survived from Jesus' invitation to say grace at the Last Supper. For the rest, we can only confess again our uneasiness at the claim that Jesus used exact Rabbinical formulae, even if they existed in his time.

As regards the purpose of the Jewish benedictions, no indication exists that the Jews regarded these as exercising any influence—on either persons or things—comparable to that attributed to the epiclesis by Christians; nor had their benedictions over foods anything to do with "releasing food for consumption." The idea that underlies them is that since all good things belong to God, it behoves men to affirm this truth by blessing God before partaking of them.³⁰

Again, Gregory Dix's reconstruction of the Last Supper is untenable even if we grant the legitimacy of his appeal to Berakôth. If the first cup were part of the relishes preliminary to a formal banquet, it could hardly have been a common cup, as Luke expressly states, for each guest was required to bless a cup for himself;³¹ moreover it is laid down in Berakôth that "a man may not drink of a cup and give it to his companions."³²

³⁰ *Tos.* iv. i. On the points in this paragraph and on the meaning of the word *habûrah*, I am glad to acknowledge a kind letter from Dr. J. Epstein, Principal of the Jews' College, London, who confirms my conclusions.

³¹ *Ber.* vi. 6, *Tos.* iv. 8.

³² *Tos.* v. 9.

If, however, a preliminary common cup were used, then Jesus must have blessed it before handing it round, in which case we must take account of the prescription that "if a man has said the benediction over the wine that comes before the meal he lets the wine that is after the meal go free";³³ yet we are expressly told by Mark that when Jesus took a cup later, *he* gave thanks, εὐχαριστήσας. Since there is no distinction between this word and εὐλογήσας (used earlier of the bread) as a rendering of the Hebrew, there is nothing to support the contention that Jesus was at this point saying the final grace and that "a cup" is more properly described as "the cup of blessing" which was drunk afterwards and did not require the ordinary benediction. It is true that I Corinthians xi speaks of "the cup" and refers to it as one drunk "after supper"; on the other hand, it does not mention the preliminary relishes which were enjoined on such an occasion, while the cup is only described explicitly as "the cup of blessing" in I Corinthians x; and there it appears to come before the sharing of the loaf. No doubt this passage will be contemporary with the shorter text of Luke, representing not what happened at the Last Supper, but, rather, what happened in certain primitive churches at a time when Christians were developing a distinctive Sunday supper-rite in substitution for the accustomed Jewish *kiddûsh* spoken over the weekly Sabbath cup. It appears to be this cup which I Corinthians calls "the cup of blessing"; and we know from a dispute of second century Rabbis recorded in Berakôth³⁴ that in their time the *kiddûsh*-cup actually was drunk at the beginning of the Jewish festival meal.³⁵ Probably it had only recently been moved from the end of the meal to this position, a change which is reflected in those accounts of the Last Supper and of the Christian eucharistic meal which originated in the East, where Jewish influence was so strong. Gregory Dix speaks with too much assurance when

³³ *Ber.* vi. 5.

³⁴ *Tos.* v. 3.

³⁵ Cf. F. L. Cirlot, *op. cit.*, p. 5 ff, for a summary of the dispute as to whether this order was established in the time of Jesus.

he refers to "the cup of the blessing" as if it were the technical description of a cup drunk at the end of formal suppers in the time of Jesus; F. L. Cirlot, as usual, is more cautious in speaking of a cup drunk after grace at a festival and formal meal as "the cup of blessing *par excellence*." But actually the description does not occur even in, and as late as, the Mishnah; its first mention is in the Babylonian Talmud.³⁶ There indeed it refers to the cup of wine included in the grace,³⁷ yet this cup was not shared; each member of the company appears to have had his own goblet, although the "master of the house" sometimes sent his, after drinking a portion of the wine, to his wife, who dined apart from the men. Nor is this cup, even in present-day practice, shared; it is drunk by him who says grace, although there is evidence that subsequent to Talmudic times a custom arose of passing the cup round the table.³⁸ It seems clear, then, that to designate the cup shared after the bread at the Last Supper as "the cup of blessing" of Jewish liturgical practice is misleading, and that *τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας* of I Corinthians x must be taken as a purely descriptive title for a cup which had been blessed. Liturgists have been naturally eager to search out a Jewish background to the Christian Supper; but they would now seem called to acknowledge that some of their conclusions were ill-founded. Their process of reasoning has been as follows: to assume that "the cup of blessing" of I Corinthians x is the same as the unnamed cup drunk after supper in I Corinthians xi; to identify both with an unnamed cup mentioned in Berakôth as drunk after a final grace; to confuse this (individual) cup, which only later was

³⁶ *Ber.* 51 b (p. 329 of the English translation by A. Cohen). I am much indebted to Dr. Cohen for answering my inquiries and giving me the references in this section.

³⁷ This appears to be a Rabbinic restriction, for in later codes the designation is given to wine used for any religious purpose. It is, e.g., nowadays the title of the cup drunk at a wedding by bride and bridegroom; also of that drunk by godfather and mother after the circumcision of a child, whose lips are likewise moistened.

³⁸ *Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim*, ch. 190 §§ 4f.

called technically "the cup of blessing", with the common cup taken after the bread in the Gospels; and finally to interpret the Last Supper itself in the light of the various Jewish customs prescribed in formal meals by *Berakôth*.³⁹ Thus has the appeal to the Mishnah introduced confusion into a scene where, before, if much was dim it was not dark, and much also was luminous. Now, once again, the action of Jesus in sharing bread and wine stands out as spontaneous and distinctive of himself.

The unjustifiable nature of Gregory Dix's reconstruction is forced upon us more evidently by New Testament scholarship. No conflate account of the Last Supper can be legitimate in view of the general dependence of Matthew and Luke—and, as may be held, of I Corinthians xi, 24-26—upon Mark, for this dependence adds to the importance of the points wherein they differ. And if the basic Marcan account contains a strongly interpretative element, how much more so the Fourth Gospel? Yet this uncritical approach, manifested in a sphere where the author disclaims to possess authority, is made the basis of his assertion concerning the liturgical studies wherein he is expert when he pronounces that the series of thanksgivings in the Jewish grace after meals "will eventually prove to be the fortress which the critics will be unable to capture."⁴⁰ Such a statement betrays a prejudice against "the critics", who can have no other interest than to learn the truth and would be prepared to accept, if the reasons given were convincing, either the traditional theory of liturgical origins or the modified form of it which Gregory Dix propounds. The traditional theory is that the eucharistic rite has a single origin; his now modified form of it is that that single origin was not a text but a liturgical

³⁹ One almost wonders that no parallel has been found in the Upper Room to what *Tos.* iv. 8. 9, says was a great custom in Jerusalem, i.e., the removal of a towel from the top of the doorway to show that no more guests might enter.

⁴⁰ P. 217.

"shape",⁴¹ in which the eucharistia itself was prayed, *extempore* at first, around four thanksgiving themes derived from the Jewish Grace; and that the primitive forms of eucharistia, thus derived from a single origin and therefore closely resembling each other, are substantially to be found in the "first halves" of the earliest anaphoras—the "second halves", which centre on the Last Supper, having been added later.

Already we have seen what pitfalls lurk in the appeal to Berakôth and to the Jewish grace at all as having been uttered by Jesus over "the cup of blessing." The contents of the grace itself now require investigation. We possess its form only in the Jewish Daily Prayer Book,⁴² and the third paragraph is acknowledged by all to be a later addition. Waiving the question as to when the first two paragraphs took their present form, we note that the key paragraph is the first. This consists of a thanksgiving for food received. The second is a series of thanksgivings for other bounties bestowed by God upon his chosen people, i.e. for the land (of Canaan), for deliverance from Egypt, for the covenant and Law, for life and grace and for constant food and sustenance; but these secondary thanksgivings end with a statement that they arise out of the following text: "Thou shalt eat and be satisfied and thou shalt bless the Lord thy God for the good land which he has given thee." Gregory Dix frankly acknowledges that he limits his appeal to this second paragraph, the chief reference of the grace, i.e. to food, necessarily having disappeared, he says, when it became the eucharistia.⁴³ But this is to take it for granted that the eucharistia has grown out of the grace and that it only

⁴¹ The "shape" is said to consist of offertory, eucharistic prayer, fraction and communion. But the evidence concerning the fraction, even in later times, is not secure. And whether there was an "offertory" in the first century depends upon whether the eucharist was then regarded as a sacrifice; much depends on the date and, especially, the interpretation of I Clement.

⁴² Ed. S. Singer, p. 279 ff; quoted by G. Dix, *op. cit.*, p. 52 f.

⁴³ P. 80.

remains to conjecture why the two are now basically different. If we are trying to prove that a prayer of central importance in one rite has grown out of another of central importance in a different rite, we can hardly begin by omitting the governing thought of the original; and the thought that controls the first paragraph of the Jewish grace equally controls the second, so that to describe the latter as a four-fold series of thanksgivings: for the creation (which it does not mention), for redemption, for the covenant, and—for food (as if it came last) is seriously to disturb its balance of proportion. Nor is it easy to discover this same four-fold series of thanksgivings, with a preliminary “naming” of God and a doxology corresponding to that of the grace, in the “first halves” of the earliest eucharistic prayers: these “first halves” appear to be different both from the Jewish grace and from one another. Let us examine them in their chronological order.

Examination of Justin Martyr’s brief references to the eucharistia suggests that it was in the first place a blessing, or praising, or thanking (no distinction can be drawn between his use of these words) of the Creator for spiritual food, akin to that pronounced by Christians before ordinary meals:

“Afterwards is brought to the president of the brethren bread and a cup of water and (mixed) wine, and taking it he offers up praise and glory to the Father of the universe through the Name of the Son and the Holy Spirit, and makes thanksgiving at length for the deeming (of us) worthy of these things from Him.” (*I Apol.* lxv.)

“For all things that we eat we bless the Maker of all through His Son Jesus Christ and through the Holy Spirit. And on the so-called day of the Sun . . . the president . . . offers up prayers and thanksgivings . . . Then follows the distribution to each and the partaking of that for which thanks were given.” (lxvii).

These quotations might also establish a *prima facie* and general connexion between a Christian grace—for spiritual or for bodily sustenance to be received—and the Jewish grace, for bodily

sustenance received already ; but this connexion Gregory Dix does not follow up in his concentration on the second paragraph of the Jewish grace. And in the latter there is no basis for Justin's thanksgiving for creation to "the Father of the Universe" ; while his thanksgiving for "the deeming of us worthy" to receive God's gifts is more naturally regarded as the Christian's acknowledgement that he possesses nothing in his own right than as a Christian equivalent (so judged by Gregory Dix) to the mention of the *covenant* in the Jewish grace. And at a later date, when Justin turned from controversy with Gentiles to controversy with Jews, he added a thought to which it is quite beyond the scope of the Jewish grace to supply a parallel, i.e. that the eucharist is a sacrifice akin to the "pure sacrifice" spoken of by Malachi and to that of "fine flour" prescribed in Leviticus on behalf of those who were being cleansed from leprosy.⁴⁴ Whether Justin's prayer ended in a doxology, or was "doxological" (triple-paragraphed, like the creed) in form, is not clear.

We come to the text of Hippolytus' eucharistia.⁴⁵ Its first half begins with a "naming" of God, but there is nothing specifically reminiscent of the Jewish grace in this ; while the doxology, to God through his "child Jesus . . . with holy Spirit", comes at the end not of the first but of the second half of the prayer.⁴⁶ The "first half" itself is a thanksgiving to God for redemption through the office and work of Jesus Christ, depicted in its various phases from the co-eternal and creative Logos to the incarnation and the passion ; it is cast as one continuous Christological statement akin to the central paragraph of the creeds, with which paragraph contemporary creed-making began. Lietzmann has demonstrated its un-Jewish character, and also its affinity with such hymnal confessions of Christ as occur in I Timothy iii, 16 and I Peter iii,

⁴⁴ *Dial.* xli.

⁴⁵ Given by Lietzmann on p. 174 f.

⁴⁶ Dix seems to think that the later additions have been inserted in Hippolytus before the primitive doxology, but after it in the Alexandrine liturgy.

18-22.⁴⁷ To try to parallel it, therefore, with four thanksgivings in the Jewish grace is, again, to disturb its proportion and controlling thought.

The first half of the Egyptian, like that of the Roman, eucharistia ⁴⁸ opens naturally with a "naming" of God; but the desired series of four thanksgivings cannot be found in Sarapion. Gregory Dix turns therefore to the "fourth-fifth century" Strassburg papyrus of the Liturgy of Mark.⁴⁹ But when we compare this MS. with the *textus receptus* as corrected by Swainson, we find that, although the latter is somewhat fuller, the two are essentially the same, containing large elements from the Liturgies of James and Basil superimposed on a groundwork of Sarapion. Each opens with a praise of God, as he is in himself and as Creator of heaven, earth, seas and rivers and of man through "thy wisdom, thy true light . . . Jesus Christ"; and from this point each moves directly to the preface and *sanctus*; neither has any analogies with the "four thanksgivings" of the Jewish grace. It is difficult to understand, therefore, why an equivalent of four *praises* on the same themes should be conjecturally reconstructed from the Strassburg papyrus to form a primitive Alexandrine eucharistia; also why a distinction between "praise" and "thanksgiving", to which value is attached elsewhere, should be waived. On the

⁴⁷ Pp. 159-167; p. 178. F. L. Cirlot, *op. cit.*, p. 52, also fails to find any mention of thanksgiving for creation or for redemption according to the Old Testament plan. His suggestion that *et sic iam prosequatur*, immediately after the dialogue, indicates the inclusion of such a thanksgiving—ending in the *sanctus*—on ordinary occasions is unlikely. Such a high note of praise could hardly have been omitted from the anaphoras for baptismal and ordination eucharists (which alone Hippolytus gives); and Lietzmann (p. 165) has pointed out that the omission of the *sanctus* is a characteristic of other Western, and especially Roman, rites. I attribute this omission to the strong anti-Jewish feeling that developed in Rome in the second century.

⁴⁸ Given by Lietzmann on p. 186 f.

⁴⁹ He gives this text in translation on p. 254 of *The Shape of the Liturgy*.

other hand, Gregory Dix's further suggestion that the preface, with the *sanctus*, formed the concluding doxology of the original Egyptian eucharistia is striking ; and bound up with it is the interesting thought that the words of the preface "we give thanks, and offer the reasonable sacrifice of this bloodless worship" referred to the worship of the angels in the *sanctus*;⁵⁰ although these words, as they occur in all versions of Mark, refer definitely to the sacrifice offered not by the angels but by "all nations". Gregory Dix does not, of course, argue that the *sanctus* has its origin in the Jewish grace, but neither does he trace it to its liturgical source.⁵¹

In carrying his appeal next to the primitive Syrian liturgy, Gregory Dix can only quote the Leucian Acts of John,⁵² which he describes however as a "Gnostic farrago". The four brief praises of "Jesus Christ our God" with which one of its eucharists opens⁵³ he regards as the equivalent of the Jewish "naming" of God, and four ensuing brief thanksgivings for redemption as the equivalent of the thanksgivings in the Jewish grace ; but there are no genuine resemblances between the two ; and no praise of God either in himself or in his creation. A fifth brief thanksgiving he considers to be the concluding doxology of this eucharistia over bread ; wine is not mentioned. Such slight links with other forms as this prayer really possesses are with the *Didache*,⁵⁴ to which, as a primitive Syrian rite,

⁵⁰ Pp. 166 and 218 ff.

⁵¹ Gregory Dix, like Lietzmann, makes the word. *προσηνέγκαμεν* etc., in Sarapion's "second half", refer back to the offertory; although, unlike Lietzmann, he thinks they were added later in explanation of what had taken place. But *προσηνέγκαμεν* may mean "we are offering", not "we have offered", so that the "second half" may be a necessary part even of Sarapion's *Urtyp*. Notice, too, the word "mysteries" in Sarapion I; if it means, in its present context, the mystery of the sacrament as in I. 3 (Wobbermin III), then Sarapion's "first half" has a parallel to the mention of the "reasonable sacrifice and bloodless service" in Mark's first half.

⁵² Quoted by Lietzmann on p. 241.

⁵³ *Op. cit.*, p. 85.

⁵⁴ Set out by Lietzmann, p. 241.

Gregory Dix, however, does not turn. The *Didache* offers, of course, no affinities whatever with the Jewish grace ; even the benedictions spoken over the wine and bread have no resemblance to the Talmudic benedictions, and although its prayer for the world-wide Church appears to have a Jewish basis, this is not to be found in the grace but in the *Tephillâh*. Lietzmann has also indicated some points of contact between the thanksgiving of the *Didache* and the Jewish prayers in Apostolic Constitutions vii.⁵⁵

The author of *The Shape of the Liturgy* admits that his theory of a primitive Christian eucharistia based on a series of four thanksgivings in the Jewish grace—although these are claimed as the “fortress” of the traditional position—cannot be fully demonstrated, and he suggests that this is due, in the case of the Egyptian and of some Syro-Byzantine liturgies, to changes in the prayer caused by the later introduction of the preface and *sanctus*, “a sort of liturgical cuckoo, which ends by taking the place of the ‘thanksgivings’ wherever it is admitted to the prayer”. In this way is explained, e.g., the absence of the hypothetical last three praises from the Liturgy of Mark, the first praise only (for creation) having survived, he says, because verbally it was too closely bound up with the opening “naming” of God to be ejected. We note, however, that praise of God as he is in himself and in his creation passes naturally and beautifully into the *sanctus* : “heaven and earth are full of thy glory” ; and actually we find this sequence three times in the Jewish daily Morning Prayer, i.e. in the *Yôtzer*, after the third petition of the *Eighteen* and at the end of the *Tahanunim*.⁵⁶ It is therefore a mistake to regard the opening of Mark’s anaphora as a praise of God whose original four-fold thanksgiving form, derived from the Jewish grace, has been changed to one of praise, and shortened, by the later introduction of the preface and *sanctus* ; it is, as it stands, a unity and complete. The Catechesis of St. Cyril of Jerusalem⁵⁷ reveals a very similar form

⁵⁵ P. 235.

⁵⁶ Cf. Lietzmann, p. 128 f., where references to the Jewish Prayer Book are also given.

⁵⁷ Quoted by Dix, *op. cit.*, p. 188 ff.

as providing the whole content of the prayer up to the epiclesis ; and in a longer Christian-gnostic dress we find the same in Sarapion.

The praise of God, whether by Jews or Christians, would tend not to be curtailed but lengthened,⁵⁸ from the mention of his creation to that of his mighty acts, his law and covenant ; and this we find to be the case in all three sections of the developed Jewish Morning Prayer to which we have referred as ending with the *sanctus*. Likewise in the ante-*sanctus* of Apostolic Constitutions there is a detailed Jewish praise of God, with Christian additions ; the transition and the *sanctus* follow : the post-*sanctus* is simply an elaboration of the eucharistia of Hippolytus.⁵⁹ All this shows, firstly, that when we find a complete series of praises or thanksgivings with a Jewish basis it is neither primitive nor derived from the grace, but reveals the influence of the *developed* Jewish liturgy ; secondly, that such a series cannot have provided the content of the earliest forms of eucharistia, for, apart from the fact that its existence in any one of them cannot be demonstrated, it issues naturally in the *sanctus*, which is admittedly no part of the earliest eucharistic prayers ; thirdly, that the preface and the *sanctus* in themselves are no obstacles to an extended series of thanksgivings. It is true that the ante-*sanctus* of Apostolic Constitutions is cut down in the later Byzantine forms which are based upon it : e.g. the Liturgy of Basil transfers some of the material to the post-*sanctus*, thereby extending the scope of the Christian thanksgiving for redemption which derives from Hippolytus ; the Liturgy of James does the same, (and incidentally the dependence of its post-*sanctus* upon the ante-*sanctus* of Apostolic Constitutions is so clear as to make extremely improbable Gregory Dix's view that it preserves an old Antiochene thanksgiving-series derived from the Jewish grace). But the Liturgy of Chrysostom, on the other hand, transfers some of the material of the post-*sanctus* to the ante-*sanctus*, thereby extending the scope of the latter, although in word-content it is

⁵⁸ Cf. Lietzmann, p. 168 n.

⁵⁹ Cf. Lietzmann, pp. 43 and 125.

very brief ; and its post-*sanctus* is briefer still. All these changes seem to be due, not to the introduction of a " liturgical cuckoo " into the eucharistia, but partly to a decline of Jewish influence in the East after it had reached its apex, and partly to the desire to find room for still further extensions of the liturgy.

There is, then, no convincing evidence that the " first halves " of the earliest anaphoras are derived from the Jewish grace or that they resemble one another in character and structure. But even less convincing is the claim that they formed the whole content of the earliest eucharistic prayers, no mention being made of the sacrifice of bread and wine which had been laid upon the altar ; Gregory Dix considers that this thought was central from the beginning but that it was expressed, in " second halves " to the prayers, only at a later date, as an explanation of " what the Church does at the eucharist ".⁶⁰ Lietzmann, of course, is an authority (and gives evidence) for thinking that the bread and wine were offered at first with silent prayer and that the Pauline eucharistia may have resembled the first half of Hippolytus ; but then Lietzmann does not think that the idea of sacrificing bread and wine was primitive in the Christian Supper, arising out of the command of Christ.

What, then, is the true history of the two halves of the prayers ? In discussing the development of Eastern rites in general, I have given ample evidence in an article in the *Harvard Theological Review* for believing that the second part of the prayer is the more primitive. Let us here consider the history of the two halves of the anaphoras of Hippolytus and Sarapion, as early representatives of the West and East respectively. Lietzmann has drawn attention to the affinity of the first half of Hippolytus with the creeds and with the Christological hymns of the Pastoral Epistles and I Peter. No doubt such forms were an element in early second-century non-eucharistic worship and would thus come naturally to be used in the construction of a liturgy of the Supper when this at length was elevated to the supreme act of worship. But some reference to the sacrifice of

⁶⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 227.

bread and wine as the central action of the liturgy would immediately be needed. This we find at the beginning of Hippolytus's "second half", superimposed apparently upon a prayer that also has a history, and when the sacrificial element is removed and allowance is made for the undisputed later additions, this "second half" is revealed as essentially a prayer for unity; also for the fruits of a good communion. But whatever the previous history of both halves, they are now a closely articulated whole; and it is a strange hypothesis that the "second half" could be removed and the central action of the liturgy could remain the same. To think so is obviously to take for granted that the Supper was from the beginning both a memorial sacrifice of Christ's death and, as such, the heart of Christian worship; it is no explanation of the problem which is recognized as crucial, i.e. Why, apparently, was there for long no historical reference to the Last Supper in the eucharistic rite? Gregory Dix has stated that the reference was hardly necessary, since the earliest eucharistic prayers were derived from the Jewish grace and thus maintained a direct link with the Last Supper; but since this hypothesis cannot survive investigation the problem remains acute. The answer here suggested is that the Supper-rite of Christians did not become an act of *sacrificial* worship until the second century; then, such a rite as that of Hippolytus was constructed out of an earlier Christological hymn as to the "first half", and out of an existing earlier Supper prayer centring in the thought of unity as to the "second half"; these being linked by, and the whole now stamped with, the new sacrificial view.

Sarapion's "first half" although very different from that of Hippolytus, would seem to have a not dissimilar origin. It is a hymn of praise, concluded by the *sanctus*, which has affinities with I Clement xxxiii; and we gather from this Epistle that its type was used in non-eucharistic worship at the beginning of the second century—at least in Rome; it would be part of the offering of prayer and thanksgiving which formed an essential element in the *δωqa* spoken of by Clement. We venture to think that these undefined *δωqa*, or sacrifices—for this is presumably

the meaning of the word⁶¹—did not yet include the bread and wine,⁶² since behind I Clement lies the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which the sacrifice of Christ consisting ultimately in a sacrifice of the will, is held to have abolished all sacrifices which did not belong to the sphere of the new covenant, the sphere of the inmost heart. Hebrews speaks of the good works of Christians, of their assembling together to the increase of faith and hope, of their sacrifice of praise and of the sacrifice of their complete consecration, but the Supper is not referred to—which is the more noteworthy since mention is made of baptism and the laying on of hands⁶³. Now the Epistle to the Hebrews, although a Roman product, was written under the influence of Alexandrine-Jewish thought and the writer was presumably exiled in Alexandria with those “of Italy” whom he mentions⁶⁴. We may, then, venture to think that I Clement, read in the light of its great authority the Epistle to the Hebrews, is a fair guide to the type of worship that prevailed in Alexandria at the turn of the first century. That worship was not yet a sacrifice of bread and wine in memory of Christ’s death, but was essentially a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. The type of it is still clear beneath the later redactions of the “first half” of Sarpion: “make us living men; give us a spirit of light . . . ; give us holy Spirit, that we may be able to tell forth and enunciate thy unspeakable mysteries”; then follows the supreme hymn of praise, the hymn of angels, the *sanctus*, in which the Christian “mystagogues” join. It is at this point that we see the true relevance of Gregory Dix’s suggestion that the first half of the Egyptian eucharistia is a hymn of praise, “a rational and un-

⁶¹ Cf. *Encycl. Bibl.*, p. 4228.

⁶² Swainson (p. xli) says that *θυσία ἀνάμικτος* is first found in Pliny, of offerings of meal and wine prevalent in the time of Numa.

⁶³ x. 5-9, x. 24 f, xii. 4, xiii. 15, vi. 2.

⁶⁴ xiii. 24. Cf. B. W. Bacon, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 149. If Rome influenced Egypt, the influence of Egypt on Rome was also strong, extending in later times, as Lietzmann says, p. 262, to the moulding of the Roman canon by the Liturgy of Mark.

bloody sacrifice to God " such as the angels are said to offer in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs (Levi).⁶⁵ Such indeed it is, yet it could never have been offered, as he thinks, over bread and wine conceived already as representations of Christ's death without some reference to them being made ; but this development of the Supper having taken place, it would be natural to use the hymn in the construction of an eucharistic liturgy, the necessary sacrificial references being added immediately in a "second half". Since Origen mentions that the eucharistia began with a thanksgiving to the Creator of all things, quotes the *Sanctus* in Sarapion's form of it and uses other language reminiscent of this liturgy,⁶⁶ it looks as if an *Ur*-Sarapion existed already in his day. When the sacrificial references are removed from the "second half" and allowances made for later editings, it is revealed, like the "second half" of Hippolytus (and also like the prayer of the *Didache*), to be essentially a prayer for unity ; also for the fruits of a good Communion. No doubt it belonged originally to some simpler Supper-rite. Thus both halves of Sarapion, as well as of Hippolytus, have an earlier history, although they are now stamped with the view that the bread and wine are symbolic representations of Christ's body and blood.

If, then, we are to find eucharistic references in, and points of contact between, the early Latin and Egyptian rites, we must seek them in the second, not in the first, halves of the prayers ; and dissimilar as these two halves are in many ways, yet they possess a similar sacrificial outlook, and also thoughts on unity and the benefits of communion which go back to early times.

The type of these two liturgies, with their onward sweep of thought, steeped in emotion, which blends their two halves into wholes, is found first in Justin Martyr's descriptions of the eucharist ; and their controlling thought as expressed in his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew would seem to have been then

⁶⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 166.

⁶⁶ Cf. Lietzmann, p. 153.

a new development. Justin defends it by Old Testament texts, but it must have taken rise in a Hellenistic-Jewish environment, for genuine Jewish thought was moving in a direction away from sacrifice.⁶⁷ That the transformation was still recent in the time of Justin is indicated by the facts that he gives only an outline of the rite and refers to the cup as "mixed". Wine at meals in Mediterranean lands, then as now, was ordinarily diluted with water, and Justin's mixed cup is surely a survival from such a Lord's Supper as is described in I Corinthians xi. We may thus trace a line of descent back from Hippolytus through Justin to I Corinthians xi.

In its present form, I Corinthians xi will belong to the generation before Justin, when the need was first felt to regulate the meal by solemn thoughts about Christ's redemptive death; so that from this point we may look still further back, to I Corinthians x and an earlier form of I Corinthians xi, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, to the Gospel of Mark. I Corinthians x appears to be a cup-bread rite, on the lines of the *kiddûsh*-supper which probably became current among the Jews only about the end of the first century A.D.,⁶⁸ and to it is added the thought that it is a sacrifice comparable with the sacrifices of Jews and Gentiles; but, as also in the *Didache*, this latter thought is not yet connected with the words of institution or Christ's death; the cup and the one loaf, to those who partake of them, are symbols only of communion with Christ and with each other. An earlier form of I Corinthians xi would clearly have described the Christian communal and charitable meal; whilst the view of the Last Supper itself at this earlier time would still be that of Mark, i.e. apparently the great event by which the Passover was abolished and a new Covenant set up, not a new rite which Christ commanded to be repeated—although, inevitably, Last Supper associations would

⁶⁷Cf. my article in *The Harvard Theological Review*. I expect this to be in the current (July) number, but my copy has not yet arrived from America.

⁶⁸Cf. p. 204 of this Essay.

colour every meal at which Christians met in consecrated fellowship.

The line of descent of Sarapion is somewhat different. Justin himself is not a witness for Egypt, but after his time the idea of the eucharist as a sacrifice developed, on symbolic lines, throughout the East. From Sarapion, then, we move backwards through the Alexandrine symbolists, to his source in the Syrian *Didache*.⁶⁹ The users of the *Didache*, a manual which has strong links with the Gospel of Matthew, may have had the Last Supper in mind as justifying participation in their eucharist ; but this latter, described definitely as a " Breaking of Bread ", is more closely linked in form with Acts, whose traditions are likewise partly Syrian. The " Breaking of Bread " in Acts can legitimately be interpreted as a cup-bread rite in view of the similar account of the Last Supper in the Lucan shorter text, this text itself being a modification of the Markan account of the Supper in the light of current Syrian Christian practice ; but the sources of Acts no doubt meant what they said when they spoke of the breaking of bread, and so we arrive at a time when the meal, indoor or outdoor, was of a simple communal type and only in the elementary stages of becoming a rite. So far as the Last Supper is concerned we do not get beyond Mark.

By both lines of descent, then, that from Hippolytus and that from Sarapion, and through a variety of early forms, the primitive type of Supper ultimately disclosed is virtually the same ; but it does not conform to any traditional theory of its outline or shape. It was a supper at which a loaf was broken and shared and, at least sometimes, a loving cup consisting of the wine of the land mixed with water was drunk ; there was as yet no special regard for the Last Supper as a recalling of

⁶⁹ The influence of Syria on Egypt was strong, as we see, too, from the large elements of the Antiochene James now incorporated in the Liturgy of Mark. All the Churches influenced one another, and the degrees and dates of such influence need to be carefully assessed.

Christ's sacrificial death, and the solemn memory of that Supper was transfigured by the glad thought of the Risen Master's speedy second coming. Moreover, what was done at the Last Supper had had nothing to distinguish it in the way of outward custom from what had been done by Jesus at many previous suppers ; it was not a Passover supper, nor any supper at which a *kiddûsh* was pronounced, nor was it a *habûrah*-supper in any sense of the word that throws light on its proceedings ; it was an ordinary supper, save for the tragic significance of its circumstances and for the import it derives—still to-day not easily or quickly grasped, even by instructed Christians—from the character and purpose of him who gave the bread and wine to his disciples. Attempts to conform the Last Supper to any type of formal Jewish supper, or the earliest eucharistic prayers to the Jewish grace, suggest misreadings of the evidence and also failure to estimate the originality of Jesus and the contribution to eucharistic developments made by the Christian Church.

THE GRACE OF HUMILITY¹

By F. P. HARTON

Surely he scorneth the scorners; but he giveth grace unto the lowly.—Proverbs iii, 34.

WE live in an age in which what is old is thought to be archaic and Christian virtues are apt to be dismissed as outmoded. The sermon which you have come to hear this morning was founded in 1684, shortly before the death of Charles II, and the preacher is required to discourse upon "the grace of Humility"; which facts may seem to lend it the pleasantly old-fashioned air of an antique survival, which may while away half an hour of a Sunday morning but need not be taken too seriously.

Whether we take this morning's sermon seriously or not depends upon whether we are living in the world as belonging to it, or whether we are trying to live in the world as Christians; in the first case humility will have no meaning for us; in the second, however far away it may seem, we shall at least realize that it is a vital part of Christian character.

Self-expression, self-realization, self-advancement—those are the ends which natural man sets before himself, but the Christian knows that they are not his ends; he knows, too, that the pride of man brings its own nemesis. The Christian, just because he believes firmly in God and Christ, has another set of values, founded on something quite different, and it will not disturb him that the world denies his values and is ignorant of their foundation; humility *must* mean *something* to him, though the world derides it; the question is, What *does* it mean? and it is that question I would ask you to face this morning.

¹ Humility Sermon. University of Oxford, February 27, 1949.

I.

You do not need me to tell you that nothing to the point is to be found in the philosophers; the ancients did not know it and the moderns (unless they be Christians) do not understand it; you will find no reference to it in a text book on Ethics. But the moment one opens the Bible the case is different: here we are forced to take account of this new thing.

"Learn of me" says our Lord. That is, above all, what we would do, but there is so much we would learn of him. What does he want us to learn? What would he teach us? Love, yes above all, but before that, humility, without which there can be no love. "Learn of me for I am meek and lowly of heart." The gospel is the revelation of the awful humility of God and we must be like that.

But he goes further: "Except ye turn", he says, "and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven." Now that is terrific. I cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven unless I turn from my adult pride to the simplicity of the child; that radical humility is the narrow and the only door by which sinful man may enter his true city, and if he does so blessed is he; "Blessed are the poor in spirit for theirs (and only theirs) is the kingdom of heaven."

Again, speaking of the life of the kingdom of heaven on earth, our Lord insists that "everyone that exalteth himself shall be humbled and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted." We are here face to face with the primal paradox of the spiritual life. The traffic of Jacob's Ladder is no one-way traffic; the proud man tries to make it so and falls off, but he who would rise up to God must descend in humility in order to do so. The paradox is resolved by St. Benedict in the great 7th chapter of his Rule in which he makes it clear that our natural ideas of up and down are themselves topsy-turvy. "If", he says, "we would scale the summit of humility, and swiftly gain the heavenly height which is reached by our lowliness in this present life, we must set up a ladder of climbing deeds like that which Jacob saw in his dream, whereon angels were descending and

ascending. That descending and ascending is to be understood by us as signifying that we descend by exalting ourselves and ascend by humbling ourselves. But the ladder itself thus set up is our life in this world, which by humility of heart is lifted by our Lord to heaven."

Once again, listen to the wise man whose words I have taken for my text: "Surely he scorneth the scorners; but he giveth grace to the humble", a saying repeated in a slightly stronger form by both SS. James and Peter: "he resisteth the proud and giveth grace to the humble." That God resists the proud is an awful thought, but it cannot be otherwise, because the proud resists him; he desires to give grace, without which we cannot make one step towards him, but it is only to the humble that he can make the gift because only the humble man opens his heart and his whole being to receive it.

II.

We have seen something of our need of humility but we have not yet seen what it is; and here we are in a difficulty. It is easy enough to visualize the virtues of justice, temperance, prudence and fortitude and even of faith, hope and charity, but humility eludes us. How are we to define it? Meekness, lowliness, poverty of spirit, yes, it is all that, but you cannot define a thing by giving it another name; moreover, I suspect that these terms convey but little to our minds. An old English writer gives us our clue. He says that humility is nothing less than "a true knowing and feeling of a man's self as he is." I know of no better definition than that.

Now notice first of all that he says it is *true*, for that is precisely what the non-Christian believes it is not. Humility is too often condemned as an untrue depreciation of oneself, a refusal to recognize one's capacities and talents, a refusal to take one's rightful place in the world, a mock modesty, an exaggeration of one's faults and shortcomings, a falsehood which is at best pusillanimous and at worst deliberate hypocrisy; and it is possible that we, too, fear that it may be some of these things. We tend to be bedevilled by Uriah Heep in this

matter, but Uriah was not a humble man (and it is only fair to say that his creator never intended us to think he was) he was merely a very nasty hypocrite. There is a false humility, which is not always consciously hypocritical, but is false nevertheless, and must be shunned like the plague; real humility is simple and true through and through; only the man who is fearless enough to face the truth about himself can be humble.

III.

What, then, is the truth? What am I? "What a piece of work is man! how noble in reason! how infinite in faculty! in form and moving how express and admirable! in action how like an angel! in apprehension how like a god! the beauty of the world! the paragon of animals!"

There you have all the arrogance of renaissance humanism; but is it true? The psalmist goes further: "Thou madest man a little lower than the angels to crown him with glory and worship"; and Genesis goes further still, "God made man in his own image." That is the wonder of our natural being and the wonder of our supernatural is greater still, for by the grace of Baptism God makes us to be even "partakers of the divine nature."

It is no part of humility to deny the wonder and dignity of one's being, rather we should affirm and rejoice in it; but notice the difference between Shakespeare and the Bible. Shakespeare makes no mention of God while the fundamental truth of the Bible is that God made us.

Here is the root of our humility; all the wonder of our being, our capacities, our virtues, all that is good and positive in us is God's creation and God's gift; our very existence is his and depends upon his will. God created us, of his love, from nothing at all, of ourselves we are nothing, we are what we are because God has made us so and our being is for his service and his glory. We dare not, then, take credit for what we know we are, we may not use our capacities for ourselves. I come from God, I belong to God, I go to God. I am God's

nothing and God's man; it is humility to realize that truth and rejoice in keeping one's proper place at the feet of God.

Shakespeare was impressed by the wonder of man but a contemporary of his was not so sure of it:

“ I know my soul hath power to know all things,
Yet she is blind and ignorant in all:
I know I'm one of nature's little kings,
Yet to the least and vilest things am thrall.
I know my life's a pain and but a span:
I know my sense is mocked in everything;
And, to conclude, I know myself a Man—
Which is a proud and yet a wretched thing.”

Considerations such as these should give us pause when we are inclined to get rather above ourselves and bring us down to earth, where we belong.

Nothingness, creatureliness are not simply descriptions of the abyss whence we have come, they are the continuing substratum of our paradoxical being. We are spirit, kin to angels, and body, highest of animals; we live, we die; we know, we are ignorant; we love God, we sin against him; we are so weak that, without his grace we cannot make one step towards him; our being is a mystery which we shall never fathom in this life but we can at least accept our limitations; only as we are humble enough to do that can we use our being as he intends us to and fulfil his purpose. God is so great; I am so small; but God made me for himself; therein lies the meaning of my being.

But there is yet another ground for our humility. We are not only men but sinful men; there is in all of us the dread legacy of Adam and we are constantly guilty of ingratitude, unfaithfulness, unlove, in a word of sin. This realization leads to penitence, with which I am not required to deal this morning; I will only say this: that the realization of our own unworthiness and sin is the final astringency of our humility.

The conviction of these truths, rooted in deep reverence for God, keeps us humble at his feet, but there is more than that, for humility is not only godward but manward and here is the

real crux. I can acknowledge my creatureliness to God, though I still find it hard to reduce my rebellious will in my life, but I find it very difficult to humble myself to my brother man. Why should I take the lowest place and be content with it when my reason tells me I am worthy of a higher? Why should I remain in obscurity when another takes the limelight? Why should I accept rudeness, spite and injury? The doing of these things is the final subjugation of pride and the test of humility and few of us succeed very well. It takes a long time to eradicate the rank weeds of resentment, envy and jealousy, which choke the delicate plant of charity, and to learn the humility of Christ.

There is in the humble man a radical good humour, an *επιείκεια*, a sense of balance and proportion, with an absence of fussiness and self-importance, because he knows that God is Lord of the Marriage Feast, and that the relative importance of himself and the others depends upon God's will and wisdom, where he can quite safely leave it. He can thus put himself in the hands of God and take what comes.

IV.

Such is the ground of humility and the more we think about it in the light of faith the more reasonable we see it to be; but that does not make us humble. Humility is, as we have seen, "a true knowing *and feeling* of a man's self as he is."

We ascend Jacob's ladder on two feet, not on one; what we know by reflection must become the motive of our living. An intellectual assent to revealed truth is the first step, but assent must become conviction; the work of the mind be one with that of the will, so that humility becomes part of oneself. We must desire to become that which we see, to weave into our life that which the mind apprehends.

V.

If you have followed me thus far I can imagine that there may be in your minds some such thought as this: "You have set before me a very high and beautiful ideal. I can see that

the humble man is not a miserable little person who spends his time in brooding on his sins and wretchedness but one whose life is based on truth and God, but this ideal is far beyond me." That is quite true but need not cause us any alarm, for the same thing is true of any good thing that we seek to do. If we have learned the truth of our creatureliness aright we have begun to understand that we are absolutely dependent upon God and cannot of our own power do any good thing. It is God himself who lightens our understanding and moves our will to love, seek and serve him; it is Christ who has united us with himself in Baptism, who brings forth his own virtues in us; we need not fear that God will withhold from us the grace of humility; "he giveth grace to the humble" and the first grace of all is that very humility to those who desire it. "Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly of heart"; it is our Lord who gives us grace to learn and grace to do, and who, by his Spirit, makes his meekness to grow in us. We need not fear the loftiness of the ideal if our mind and will are set to seek it. But we must respond to grace, it is for us to *seek* the ideal. Grace is useless without our co-operation and that is a work of great delicacy and patience.

No one can become humble by force nor by constantly watching his humility. It is possible, on looking back on a certain action, to say "that was rotten pride" but it is not possible to say of another action "that was humble" for such a judgement is in itself pride. Absorption in one's own humility (other than one's grief at its unworthiness) makes for a self-consciousness which defeats its own ends. Humility is to be found more surely in the unself-regarding contemplation of the great truths of the faith than by an introspective analysis of one's wretched self and one's reactions to the humbling circumstances of life.

We grow in humility as we learn slowly and often painfully to look away from ourselves and our petty personal desires to God and his will; to empty ourselves of self that we may be full of God. Thus we arrive at our final and simplest affirmation of humility, contained in one word—"self-emptying".

No created thing can contain more than its being allows; one cannot at the same time be full of self and full of God (and we want to be full of him, however vaguely we may be conscious of that desire) let us then patiently set about emptying ourselves of our wretched little bits of pride, self-will and self-satisfaction that we may "put on Christ"; so shall we learn by experience that "God giveth grace to the humble" the grace of all virtues.

THE ARMINIAN NUNNERY

(1641)

EDITED BY MAURICE HUSSEY

THIS rare but well-known tract is not reissued as a challenge to the reverence paid to the community at Little Gidding; nor to attempt to adjudicate between Mr. A. L. Maycock (in his *Nicholas Ferrar of Little Gidding*), who calls such attacks venomous and diabolical, and those who find the church redolent of forced piety, like Mr. Hugh Trevor-Roper (in his *Archbishop Laud*). The anonymous author found a letter from Edward Lenton,¹ and mixing truth and falsehood with extreme cunning, produced this remarkable plagiarism. The additions, subtractions and reinterpretations caused Lenton great horror. His ingenuous phrases of compliment are questioned with the addition of epithets: "seeming civilitie" and (a Puritan hit) "second kiss". Fatuous ejaculations abound in the revision of the letter, and the pamphlet ends with the only substantial addition to its text. The most interesting of the suppressions is the veiled reference to the pulpit's prominence among the furnishings: the practised author knew that Puritan readers would not expect to see it in an exalted place in a nunnery. Little harm seems to have been done by the calumnies of this tract; the destruction of the church in 1646 cannot be traced to the concluding advice to the Parliament. The unkindest hit at the "Company of Farrers" was only the soured attitude towards their temporal works of mercy ("they pretend to be very charitable") which should have been free of sectarian bickering.

One reprint of this text can be traced², although some portions of it have been more recently quoted (in Bernard Blackstone, *Ferrar Papers* and Mansfield Forbes, ed. *Clare College*, 1328-1928). The original copies have an illustration showing a nun and the church in the background with an incredible tower for which no other authority exists. On one hand *The Arminian*

¹ To Sir Thomas Hetley (printed in *Nicholas Ferrar, Two Lives*, ed. J. B. Mayor), written in 1634. Could William Prynne have written this tract?

² *Peter Langtoft's Chronicle* (ed. T. Hearne, Oxford, 1725).

Nunnery shows the follies of the Calvinists, still evident in spite of sympathetic researches into Puritan life and habit. On the other, the piety of the Caroline Church remains undenigrated by the Papistical prolocutors or the rest of the gibes.

Mr. T. S. Eliot's viewpoint of the Civil War ("united in the strife that divided them") introducing Little Gidding to new readers provides the tolerant attitude which can best be taken in introducing this tract.

THE / ARMINIAN NUNNERY / or, / A BRIEF DESCRIPTION / and Relation of the late erected *Monasticall* Place, called the ARMINIAN / NUNNERY at little GIDDING in / HUNTINGDON-SHIRE. / Humbly recommended to the wise consideration / of this present PARLIAMENT. / *The Foundation is by a Company of Farrars at GIDDING.*¹

THERE stands a faire House well scituated with a fine Grove and sweet Walks, Latticed and Gardined on both sides; their livelihood or Revenew about 500l. per Annum. One of my Lord Mountagues Mansion-Houses being within two or three miles off called Hemmington House not farre from Oundle. A Gentleman comming to visit the said House, was first brought to faire Spacious Parlour, where soone after appeared the Old Gentlewomans second sonne, a Batchelour of plain presence, but pregnant of speech and parts, unto whom when I had deprecatd and excused my selfe for so sudden and bold a visit, he entertained me with seeming civilitie and humilitie.

After deprecations and some complements past betwixt us, he said I should see his Mother if I pleased, and I shewing my desire, hee went up into a Chamber, and presently returned with his Mother (a tall ancient Gentlewoman about 80. years of age) shee being Matron of the House, his elder Brother a Priest-like man in habit and haire. Now he had a Sister married in the House to one Mr. Cooles,² who had 14. or 15. Children in the House, and of these with a man servant and 2. or 3. maid-servants the Family then consisted.

I was permitted to salute the Mother and Daughters, as we use

¹ Printed for Thomas Underhill MDCXLI. The original copy has a picture representing a nun in black before the Church as it was before it was attacked. The text is reprinted by permission of the University Librarian, Cambridge.

² The name was Collett.

to salute other women; and after we were all sitten Circular, I had leave to speake ingenuously of what I had heard and did or might conceive of their House. I first told him what I had heard of the Nunns at Gidding; of two watching and praying all night; of their Canonick houres, of their Crosses on the outside and inside of the Chappell; of an Altar richly decked with Tapestry, Plate and Tapers; of their Adorations, genuflections, and geniculations, which I told them plainly might strongly favour of Superstition and Popery.

Now you must understand that the younger Brother who first came unto me is a jolly pragmaticall and Preist-like fellow, and is the mouth for all the rest, and he began to cut me off, and answered with a serious protestation (though not so properly) that, he did as verily beleeeve the Pope to be Antichrist, as any Article of his Faith, which I noted and gave the hearing: and therein if he spake from his heart, he much differed from the opinions of Priest Shelford, Priest Squire, Dr. Drassig, the red Dragon of Arminians, and other eminent Arminians.

He denied the place to be a Nunnery, and that none of his Neeces were Nunnes: but he confessed that two of his Nieces had lived the one thirtie, the other thirty and two yeares Virgins, and so resolved to continue (as he hoped they would) to give themselves to Fasting and Prayers; but had made no Vowes.

For their Canonick hours, he said they usually prayed 6. times a day, viz. 2. times a day publikly in the Chappell, and 4 times a day more privatly in the House; in the Chappell after the Order of the Booke of Common Prayer, at both times chanting out aloud the Letany; and in their House particular private Prayers for a Familie.

And hee being asked, if they spent so much time in Praying, they would leave little for Preaching, or for their weekly calling for which the Text is pregnant: He that turneth away his eares, from hearing the Law, his Prayer is abominable: PRO. 18. and 19. And the fourth Commandment: Six dayes shalt thou labour etc. Unto which this Priest-like pregnant Prolocutor answered but slubbringly, That sometimes a neighbour Parson would come and preach in their Chappell; and to the other; That their Calling (forsooth) was to serve GOD, which he tooke to be best: Oh the stupid and blind devotion of these people, for Men and Women in health of able and active bodies and parts to have no particular Callings, or to quit their Callings, and betake themselves to I wot not what new forme of Fasting and Prayer, and a contemplative idle life, a lip-labour devotion, and a will-worship, *Eccl.* 4. & 17. which by the word of God is no better than a Specious kind of idlenesse, as St. Augus-

tine termes them to be but *Splendida peccata*: as if diligence in our particular lawfull callings were no part of our service to God.

And doubtlesse such a Monastick Innovation in a settled Church-government, is of dangerous consequence in many respects.

For their night-watching and rising at 4. of the Clock in the morning (which was much for the Matron of 80. yeares of age, and for her Grand-children) the Priest-like Prolocutor did not want a premeditated excusive Justification: But how neere it complieth with the superstitious Nunneries in Popish places beyond the Seas, I and others that have travelled and seene them may plainly perceive and notifie; especially considering he could not but confesse there were every night two (*alternatim*) continued in their Devotions untill the rest rose.

For their divers Crosses, the Prolocuter made me this answer; That they were not ashamed of the badge of Christian profession, which the first Propugnators of Faith bore in their Banners, and which are in our Church Discipline retained unto this day.

How confused and absurd this Crosse Answer was, let every Christian man judge.

On the Chimney-peice where wee sate, there was a Manuscript Tableture with this Inscription following, whereof I desired, and had a Coppy transcribed.

I H S

He that by reprove of our errors or remembrance of that which is more perfect seekes to make us better is welcome and an Angel of God.

And

Hee that by a cheerefull participation of that which is good confirms us in the same, is welcome as a Christian Friend.

But

He that anyway goes about to divert or disturb us in that which is and ought to bee amongst Christians though it be not usuall with the World, is a burthen whiles he stayes and shall beare his judgement whosoever He be.

And

Hee that faults us in absence for that which in presence hee made shew to approve of, shall by a double guilt of flattery and slander violate the bonds of Friendship and Christianity.

MARY FERRAR Widdow, Mother and Matron of this Familie, aged about 80. yeares, that bids adue to all feares and hopes of this world, and desires to serve God.

• The Letters of the top of which Inscription are the proper Characters of the Jesuites in every Booke and Exhibite of theirs. And the lines of the Inscription, how full of nonsense, justification and ostentation of superstitious devotion, besides their Creation of Angels of God; Let every understanding Christian Reader or hearer hereof judge.

The Prolocutor in justification of the Jesuiticall forme of Letters which I excepted against: he said it was the auspicious name worthy to be the Alpha and Omega of all our Actions, and wee are commanded to write such things upon the posts of our Houses, and upon our Gates: Whereas indeed the Text which hee aimed at is in the Old Testament and not in the New, where there is no mention of Jesus but Jehovah: And the words are most plainly, Moses Precept of the Law of God, and not of the Name, &c. *Deut. 6. &c.*

Therefore this his Apologeticall answer was nothing but ignorant Eloquence, or eloquent ignorance; most grossly and absurdly applied.

This Prolocutor confessed himselfe to bee about 42. yeares old, was a fellow in a House in Cambridge (he named not what House) and that he had taken Orders of a Deacon (but he said nothing of his having beene at Rome, as it is well knowne he hath beene).

Now I was invited by this Deacon to goe with him into the Chappell to their devotion, at the entrance whereof this Priest-like deft Deacon made a low obeysance, a few paces farther lower, and comming to the halfe-pace which is at the East end where the altered Table stood, hee bowed and prostrated himselfe to the ground, then he went up into a faire large reading place (having placed mee above with a faire, large Window Cushion of green Velvet before me). The Mother Matron with all her Trainee, which were her Daughters and Daughters Daughters, who with foure Sonnes kneeled all the while on the bodie of the halfe pace, all being in black gownes, and as they came to Church, in round Monmouth Capps, all I say in blacke, save one of the Daughters who was in a Friers grey gowne.

We being all placed before the Deacon (for now so we must call him) with a very loud and shrill voyce began and trolled out the Letanie, and read divers other Prayers and Collects in the Book of Common Prayer and Athanasius his Creed; and concluded with the forme of words: of, The peace of God, &c.

Their Service ended, the Mother with all her Company attending my comming downe; but I durst not come very neere lest I might happily have light upon one of the Virgins lippes, not knowing

whether they would have taken a second kisse in good part or no, with their civill salutations towards mee, which I returned them a far off, they departed from the Chappell home.

Now the Deacon and I left, I observed the Chappell in generall to bee fairely and speciously adorned with herbes and flowers naturall and artificiall, and upon every pillar along on both sides the Chappell (such as are in Cathedrall Churches) Tapers; I meane, great Virgin-waxe-Candles on every Pillar: The halfe-pace at the upper end (for there was no other division betwixt the body of the Chappell and the East end) was all covered with Tapestry and upon that halfe-pace stood the Altar-like Table, with a rich Carpet hanging very large on the halfe-pace, and some Plate, as a Challice, and Candlesticks with waxe-Candles in them: By the preaching place stood the Font, a Leg-laver and cover all of Brasse cut and carved with Imagery worke, the Laver of the bignesse of a Barbers Bason, and the Cover had a Crosse erected on it. And this is all I had leisure to observe in the Chappell.

Then I made bold in temperate termes to aske the Deacons what use they made of so many Tapers on the Table, and in the Chappell, he answered (forsooth) to give them light, when they could not see without them. And having formerly as I said before obtained leave to say what I listed, I asked him to whom he made al these Courtesies, bowings and prostrations, he said to God; I told him that Papists make no other answer for their bowing to Images and Crucifixes, yet we account them Idolaters for so doing, as justly wee may: Hee said we have no such warrant for the one; but for the other we had a precept (forsooth) to doe all things with decencie and order, as he tooke this to be. I demanded then why hee used not the same solemnitie in his house, and whether he thought the Chappell more holy then his House, he said no, but that God was more immediately present in the Chappell then in the House, whilst we were worshipping him, I replied that God was as present at Paules Crosse, as in Paules Church, at the Preaching-place at White-hall and the Spittle-Sermons, as in other Churches and Chappells. For wheresoever two or three &c. and in those fore-named places, no not in the bodie of any Churches, though there be Sermons and Prayers there, we do no use this threefold reverence, or bowing, or prostrating no nor the Papists themselves, unlesse in the Chancel towards the East, wherein an Altar or some Crucifix is; He answered me somewhat confusedly, for this their trinary number of bowing which I did not well understand, nor well conceive what he meant.

It seemes moreover that at their monthly receiving the Sacrament (which this defendant Deacon performeth and consecrateth

the bread and wine) their servants when they received, were attended by their Master and Mistris, and not suffered to lay or take away their owne trenchers as it is reported.

They also take upon them to be Phisitians and Chirurgions in ministring Physicke and Chirurgery for the sick and sore, and pretend to be very charitable to the poore; but as it is verily thought in a meritorious way.

They also take upon them to be Catechisers and to task many poore people with Catechisticall questions; Which when they come and can make answer thereunto, they are rewarded with money and their dinners, and so they pretend they feed the poores bodies and soules, But their Catechisme or Catechisticall questions (some say) are strange ones and for different from our Orthodox Catechismes. You may take notice that since the observation of the premisses, th'old Matron of the place is dead.

And now beloved and Christian Reader, you have had an ingenuous Relation of this late erected religious House for the Service of God (as the Founders would have it termed and held.) But certes we may wonder at nothing more that in a settled Church-government our Bishops who are accounted Governours of the Church will permit any such erection or Foundation, so nearly complying with Popery, and that by a fond and fantastical Family of Farrars, the principall Preist a poly-pragmaticall Fellow, having beene at Rome, and there (as it is credibly reported) he was conformable to all the abominable Ceremonies and Services of the Church of Rome. Now forsooth, in outward shew, hee would pretend that hee and the rest disclaime the Pope and Poperie, but by and by you shall see him and his Companions crouching, cringing, and prostrating to the ground to the Altar-like poore Communion-Table, or the rich gilded candle-sticks, and waxe Tapers and other knacks thereon standing; And for another shew that they would not bee accounted Popish, they have gotten the Booke of Martyrs in the Chappell; but few or none are suffered to read therein, but onely it is there (I say) kept for a shew; and besides their lip-labour of trolling out the Letanie foure times a day, they have promiscuous private Prayers all the night long by nightly turnes, just like as the English Nunnes at Saint Omers and other Popish places: which private Prayers are (as it semes) taken out of John Cozens his Cozening Devotions, (as they are rightly discovered to be by Orthodox men) and extracted out of divers Popish Prayer-Bookes. This Fryer-like Familie, and as they are not unfittly termed Arminian Nunnery have divers other Commick and Mimmick actions of will-worship to the great dishonour of Almighty God, who will be served in Spirit and truth, and he will once say unto them as hee

did by the Prophet Isaiah, to the superstitious and ceremonious Jewes, Who hath required this at your hands ? &c.

Surely we may marvell that the present Primate of all England and Metropolitane being the principall Governour of the Church, under his sacred M^ajestie, and as hee professeth such an Anti-Papist and enemy to Superstition and Idolatry, should permit this Innovation, and connive at such canting, betwixt the barke and the tree in matter of Religion: But by what hath been related of these Peoples practises, we see that position made good, That Arminianisme is a bridge to Popery, the bridge was not not onely made (a great part of the Clergie of this Land being downright Arminians) but some have past over it; witness Preist Shelford, Preist Cozens, and this Familie in this Booke treated on with divers others, and had not God of his great mercy undermin'd the chiefe Arches of that bridge, causing them to fall in the River of confusion, wee have cause to think that the greater part of this Land would also have followed the rest; but now God hath hindred it, not only by breaking the bridge in the just downfall of many of the chiefe of the Arminian Faction, but also by setting up that strong, high, and thick wall of the late Parliamentary nationall Protestation; for which (as also for all his mercies at all times, especially for this years wonders) his name be for ever praised (say I) and let all Protestants say, Amen.

FINIS

ERRATUM: On page 67 of "The Character of an Old English Puritane" (*C.Q.R.* April/June, 1949), Mr. Soden's work is, of course, on Goodman, Bishop of Gloucester, and not as stated.

THE IMMINENCE OF THE PAROUSIA

By **FREDERICK A. M. SPENCER**

I confess to having long cherished two main interests: the future of humanity, and the future of human individuals. And I am constitutionally enough of an optimist to believe that both will be supremely good. Moreover, I am so convinced of the embracing unity of life as to think that, not only in the consummation of that supreme good, but also in the progress to it, humanity and human beings are fundamentally inseparable—this despite the now inevitable interruption and severance by death. I rejoice in the thought that I am a human being and therefore a member of God's great human family—in its origin, its growth, its struggles and agonies, its hard-won achievements and glad triumphs—and destined, I dare to hope, to participate in its ultimate blissful perfection. Because God is God, and because I am I, it must be so.

The progress and perfecting of humanity and the progress and perfecting of its component personalities are, I am confident, interwoven. But they should be considered in distinction, and it is the former that is my primary theme at the moment. How the latter is involved in the former will, I venture to affirm in anticipation, appear subsequently. It is, one may observe, the future of the human race, rather than the future of individual human beings, that appears to engage people's minds at the present, evoking fluctuating hopes and fears, to judge by the prevailing topics of journalism and current literature and broadcast talks and discussions. What is going to happen, or is likely to happen, to man collectively, both in the lesser aggregations of nations and in the inclusive aggregation of all mankind, is the dominant question and interest.

My argument advances through several steps or stages.

The first consists of the contention that man's future is determined, very largely anyhow, by his morality—morality in the widest sense. For morality is a great function of life—the supreme function of life, indeed, at least on the natural level. It is comprised of activities and dispositions to activities for the removal and avoidance of evil and the maintenance and attainment of good. I suppose I might describe my ethical creed as “ideal utilitarianism”—not the crude and shortsighted utilitarianism which looks to “the greatest happiness of the greatest number”, as a general state of satisfied prosperity under prevailing earthly conditions, but a view of virtue as a principle of life germinating and expanding in this age for its increasing fulfilment in a succeeding age and beyond in an eternal order. Anyhow, it is not, I imagine, disputable that if people behave wrongly, becoming more and more dishonest, indolent, dissolute, callous, and generally selfish and sensual, society will degenerate and disintegrate. On the other hand, if people practice and advance in all the virtues, they will, apart from external misfortunes, prosper in all that constitutes well-being. If only all, or nearly all, would be good, merely according to the widely accepted ideas of goodness, how much better life for us humans on this globe would be! Oh, of course there are diseases and accidents afflicting both vicious and virtuous, and in any case death and bereavement. Still, we may, to simplify our argument, leave these troubles for a while out of account. At any rate, things in this world would be much better, life would be much more worth living, if we all behaved well, really well, and tried to do better and better.

But what is to induce people to behave well—to be kind and generous and to control their appetites and passions and to subordinate their private to the public welfare; and the nations likewise—to do unto other nations as they would that other nations should do unto them, all making substantial contributions to the general benefit of mankind? I premise, as the second stage in my argument, that religion is the main determining factor in morality, and in the long run essential to its continuance and still more to its improvement. As belief in

a Supreme Being, who favours the righteous and disapproves and punishes evil-doers, declines, so will the observance of the customary moral precepts and standards decline. The ill-effects of loss of religious conviction and neglect of public worship and religious study are not usually very apparent at the beginning. Most continue for a while to behave fairly decently—from force of habit, from the surviving relics of conscience, from innate kindness, and very much out of regard for the opinion of relations and associates and employers. But adolescents, with their surging passions and plastic characters, readily succumb to temptations, especially sensual temptations, if they have discarded religion as discredited superstition. And the rot once started spreads apace. Even those congenitally upright and generous are liable to become cynical and callous as they are disheartened by the surrounding laxity and licentiousness, a fact which I suggest was in our Lord's mind when he said: "Because iniquity shall abound, the love of the many will wax cold."

Besides all this, loss or absence of religious faith predisposes, as psychologists and psychotherapists have discovered, to manifold mental disorders, the complexes and neuroses and psychoses of which we hear so much. "How close is the connexion between psychoneuroses and training in religious character can be seen in the observation of Dr. Jung. He says he has never seen a patient in the second half of life whose trouble was not due, in the last resort, to the fact that he never had, or had lost, that which religion gives to all her devotees. Nor, he adds, has he ever seen one cured who did not regain or find religion." And what religion gives is threefold: "the unification of our personality, the sense of security, and the sense of belonging."¹ But, more simply and essentially, religion mediates the spiritual action of God on men, thus producing moral regeneration and growth.

There is, however, a more imminent and appalling peril

¹ *Nervous Diseases and Character.* By John G. McKenzie, pp. 6 and 36.

for an irreligious world. For men, being frail and transient creatures, naturally require that sense of attachment to a mightier and more enduring entity. Consequently, with the repudiation of belief in a supernatural order, they are prone to seek the like in the natural order. Now, the most generally specious substitute for the supernatural Creator is the nation organized into an omniscient state with unlimited authority; for this is vastly more powerful than its individual members, and to some extent protects and supports them from cradle to grave. The fact that it cannot bestow immortality is somehow ignored. Hence the *Ersatz-religion* of nationalism, fervid and aggressive nationalism, with its pretension of embodying some grandiose principle of human betterment, whether the dominance of the superior race, or the exaltation of the common man—the latter much more widely appealing and ethically plausible. There is this distinction between the Nazi-Fascist and the Communist ideologies: that the former is unashamedly nationalistic and the latter covertly so, at least in its modern guise. But both make for war, since the idol must vindicate his power and majesty in relentless crushing of adversaries and unbelievers. And it is war increasingly murderous and destructive as physical science augments man's power to manipulate the energies inherent in matter. As Lowes Dickinson wrote some years ago, in *War: its Nature, Cause, and Cure*: "If mankind does not end war, war will end mankind. This has not been true in the past, but it is true in the present. For the present has produced something new. It has produced science." Since then, we may add, science has produced the atomic bomb.

Human welfare and progress depend on morality. Morality depends on religion. We now come to the third stage of the argument. On what does religion depend? The answer is, I submit, on revelation—a revelation by God. If men are to believe in and know about God sufficiently to obey and worship him, God must reveal himself—at least, his existence, his character, and his will for mankind. Of course, to quote the Apostle to the Gentiles: "The invisible things of God since

the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even his everlasting power and divinity". However, the argument from design, as it is called, is by no means free from objections. If the world was made by a good God, how are we to account for the bad things and events in it, such as tornadoes and devastating floods and earthquakes, and the bacteria of many foul and tormenting maladies, not to mention the licence allowed to tyrants and war-makers before they come to grief? And apart from all this, the revelation of the Creator in his physical creation does not afford much clear information as to the conduct he requires of men—the extent, for instance, to which he would have them amicable and forbearing and peaceable, or the reverse. God has also, it has been widely believed, revealed himself and his will for men through prophets and mystics, who have told, or attempted to tell, what they have heard and experienced of him. But how can it be demonstrated that they were not victims of their own disordered imaginations?

Yet in what way could God most adequately reveal himself to humanity? Surely through a human person, since of all creatures in the world human beings appear most akin to God—especially in their intelligence and moral volition and capacity for the higher emotions. And this Christians confidently believe God has actually done in Jesus of Nazareth, so that he could say: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father". However, since Jesus was, like other men, finite in space and time, and his Divinity was not apparent even to the majority of the people who saw and heard him, it has been necessary that there should be special messengers to proclaim Jesus and his Divinity far and wide, and, besides, an organization for the application of the revelation to human life. In other words, the revelation of God in Christ had and has to be implemented both by missionary preaching and by the Church. But how then, after all these centuries, has it not done more for the regeneration and transformation of mankind, not even averting the recent and present distress and peril? And what

prospect is there of its becoming more effective in the centuries to come? Certainly, as Christians, we are not content with the conception of Jesus as supreme Revealer of God, believing that by his death and resurrection he has made available to men the good offered in the Gospel—the good under its three aspects of salvation and eternal life and the Kingdom of God. But this makes it the more perplexing that religious disbelief and the consequent wickedness are so appallingly rife. Are we to hope that increased evangelistic ardour and ecclesiastical efficiency will produce in the near future what preachers and prophets and pastors have not succeeded in accomplishing during all the centuries since Christ appeared on earth—namely, the general conversion to living faith in God, needed to forestall the creeping degeneration and maybe sudden destruction with which mankind is threatened?

But to some this may seem to be taking too despondent a view of human nature. May we not look to its latent powers of recovery, such as have enabled mankind to survive previous seasons of decadence and to enter on new phases of progress? This brings us to the fourth state of the argument, in which I contend for the necessity for a renewal of the revelation more widely apparent and ampler and more convincing than before. For we should bear in mind that the revelation of God in Christ was subject to historical limitations, transmitted by one who lived at a certain time and in a certain land, with all the comprehensibility and attractiveness of its embodiment in a unique human personality. Therein lay and still lies its potency; but therein also, I make bold to say, lies and will lie its limitations. For as time goes on, it will, if not renewed, become more and more remote, with diminishing challenge and appeal. If civilized mankind somehow surmounts or hews a way through its present troubles and perils, will it, after the lapse of two thousand more years, be still susceptible to the story of Jesus in Palestine—all that he said and did of truth and wonder, his death and subsequent appearing alive to his friends, with its significance for men? Or—to stretch our imagination—what after twenty thousand, or a hundred

thousand years, if humanity still exists on this planetary globe ? However much scholars and historians might in such a far distant future claim to have proved the Gospel record to be historically valid, the majority of men engrossed with worldly affairs would be prone to regard the Jesus therein portrayed as a legendary figure of a pre-scientific and credulous antiquity. I discern therefore no prospect for the religious conversion of humanity sufficient for its spiritual quickening, or even for its secular progress, except a new—or, if we prefer to call it, a renewed—revelation of God's being and will for men. And how can this renewed and renewing revelation be mediated otherwise than through a human personality ? And who can this human personality be but the one who conveyed the revelation before ? And this agrees with what he himself foretold : “ the Son of Man coming on the clouds of Heaven in power and great glory ” ; “ the Son of Man seated on the right hand of Power (Omnipotence) and coming with the clouds of Heaven ” ; repeatedly also in parables and isolated dicta ; to which we may add the reassuring declaration of the two in white apparel at the Ascension : “ This same Jesus who hath been received up from you into Heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have beheld him going into Heaven ”.

But this brings us to the question why he has waited so long. Might he not have appeared in power and great glory very soon after his resurrection, so saving the world from the subsequent centuries of disorder and corruption and war ? This is, in fact, an expansion of the wistful query put to him by the Apostles shortly before the Ascension : “ Lord, dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel ? ” I venture to outline an explanation. Surely the long delay was designed so as to ensure a certain measure of acceptance and co-operation among his subjects. He commissioned his disciples to go forth as his witnesses over the whole inhabited earth. He also held out to them and their successors the prospect of high offices in his kingdom, if they should carry out faithfully the tasks which he would set them, with responsibilities corresponding to their proved competence. He would have mankind at large

prepared to recognize and submit to him ; he would also have some, the " saints," trained for mediating his rule to the rest of mankind. When these conditions have been realized, he will come again, in order, not only to tell people about his Heavenly Father and how he would have them live, but also to supervise, in personal and visible presence, the reconstitution of their lives, and to exercise continual direction of the future evolution of the race. Such, I submit, is the golden promise of the Gospel, and such the reason for the delay in its fulfilment.

This brings us to the fifth section of our argument, that concerning the necessity for the judgement which Christ will carry through upon his arrival. Several of the parables have to do with this, and he is thrice in the New Testament referred to as the judge of, or as destined to judge, both " quick and dead ". If the revelation is to be fully effective, it must be applied with insight and wisdom and with such compulsion as will be necessary for any unwilling to accept it. For most people will lack the intelligence and self-knowledge and impartiality needed to apply it properly to themselves. And for this authoritative application Christ alone will be sufficient. He only can adequately reveal God's will, and he alone can adequately judge in accordance therewith. And the judgement must be followed by elimination of what is evil or unworthy in mankind and by the rehabilitation of the good in mankind, as shown in the parable of the Tares of the Field. And among those who have undertaken work for him, any with a bad record he will degrade, and to them that have done well he will assign positions of responsibility corresponding to their degrees of proved merit and capacity. And from the masses of mankind he will take the more virtuous, with special regard to kindly behaviour, to form the general populace of his commonwealth, relegating the rest to exile of some sort. Such, in very brief outline, appears to be the scheme of judgement which he will carry out, for the establishment of the Kingdom of Heaven upon earth.

And then, sixthly, we cannot think that, having got the

world into order by means of judgement, Christ will then disappear from it, with the likelihood of fresh disorder arising in the not yet completely sanctified race. Rather will he remain, constantly, or frequently, visible, so as to control and direct humanity's development, in all that constitutes human life, spiritually and otherwise, as indeed we may gather from sundry indications both in Hebrew prophecy and in his own recorded utterances, as well as in the millennial vision of the Apocalypse. He will continue to be lifted up in order to draw all men unto him, and through him to the Heavenly Father, that they may be made perfect as his children. Eventually, we may suppose and as we read in the second epistle of Peter, this globe will be annihilated, and there will be a new heaven and a new earth ; but that lies beyond our present outlook.

But, seventhly, may we entertain the hope of the return of the Saviour and King of the world in a not very distant future ? Certainly, there have been several occasions since he withdrew from human view when there was eager expectation of his almost immediate advent, which proved to have been premature. Also there have been times when religion was at low ebb in Christendom, and both Church and society parlously corrupt ; but somehow there came recovery and a new advance in faith and morality. However, there is one notable difference between the present crisis and all these previous crises : they were of very limited area, but this is rapidly becoming world-embracing. Science is sweeping away the barriers that isolated peoples and civilizations, so that news and ideas and crazes spread with lightning speed over the nations. And therewith a vital issue confronts mankind. Because of the discrediting of the superstitious creeds of antiquity and the decay of outworn social and political institutions from the corrosion of scientific testing, there is emerging the stark contrast of Christianity in its essential spirituality and the materialistic creed of so-called "Communism." The conflict bodes to be fierce and prolonged, with unparalleled devastation before victory comes to either. Will not then the Lord, as he promised, shorten the days of the tribulation ?

Moreover, in order to appreciate the crisis in its full fatality, we should consider what Christ himself disclosed about an adverse personal or quasi-personal being invisible to men in the flesh—the entity named Satan, who assayed to thwart him in his redemptive mission, with the object of securing for himself an independent status of deity. Most probably it was the same that the Apostle meant when he remarked : “The god of this age hath blinded the minds of them that believe not”—that is, rendered them insensitive to the light of the Gospel. We should do well, too, in this connexion to ponder on the two visions of the Beast in the Revelation, how, as the chief agent in human form of the Dragon, alias Satan, he cajoles and coerces people to worship him, and also destroys the capital of worldly civilization with military force—both alike with the object of getting mankind under the sway of his infernal lord. All this, interpreted with allegorical licence, seems to throw light on the source of certain perversities and manias obsessing people widely over the world in the present turmoil. One would think that Satan aims, not at destroying men, nor even at their total degradation, but fomenting immorality and conflict so far as is needed for dissociating them from God, in order that they may be induced to obey and worship him instead. How can any political or social reform, any educational programme, any plan of international co-operation, or even, be it said, the most assiduous religious enthusiasm and evangelism, counteract this diabolical scheming and bewitchment? Is not the Son of God the appointed victor over the Devil?

Now, Christ mentioned various signs by which his disciples on earth at the time should be apprised when his return should be imminent, of which I single out this for particular attention : “This gospel of the Kingdom must first be proclaimed in the whole inhabited earth for a testimony to all the nations ; and then shall the end come”. There are still, I understand, considerable tracts of the land surface of the globe practically unexplored and unaffected by modern civilization, with tribes that have not yet learnt about Christ. But it can-

not, one would imagine, be many years before geographical and commercial enterprise will have opened roads to the missionaries of the Gospel, if indeed some do not find their way in advance. Thus there will very soon be not a tribe of men on earth without some idea of the Son of Man and Son of God. And this condition for his return is quite understandable; for we may well think that he would require that he should be universally recognized when, girt about with the glory of Heaven, he breaks in upon the astonished gaze of mankind, as King claiming obedience from all, and welcomed in adoration by the many who have already known him as Saviour.

He once told a parable about the owner of an estate who, going away for a while, appointed various tasks to his servants, and to the door-keeper the special one of looking out for the signal of his return on the sky-line, in order, presumably, that he should forthwith tell the others, so that they should make ready to give their master his due reception on arrival. Are Christ's watchers now on the look-out for the signs which he told them of his approach? And have they noticed any? And is his Church in general disposed to heed their warnings?

But finally, how do human individuals participate in the salvation and progress of humanity, and how will they enter into the world-wide beatitude which he will bring at his return?—the question which we noticed at the beginning and deferred to the last. For it would be a heartlessly "totalitarian" conception of redemption that excluded all who had passed into and out of embodied humanity before its consummation under the reign of the Redeemer. The connexion between humanity and human beings in their salvation and perfecting is indicated by the word *anastasis* (resurrection) — a term which always in the New Testament, when applied to the so-called dead, signifies return to the physical world of men, certainly in visible, if not in physical, form. We must, however, distinguish two grades of resurrection—resurrection *from* the dead, and resurrection *of* the dead. So far, if we are to

believe St. Paul, Christ alone has risen from the dead, others having to wait till his visible return : " Christ the firstfruits, afterwards they that are Christ's at his appearance " (or " arrival").² It was evidently to this that our Lord referred when he made this reply to some Sadducees who questioned him on the subject : " They that are accounted worthy to attain to that age and to the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage; for neither do they die any more " (Luke xx, 35, 36). And then he went on to speak about " the resurrection of the dead " (Matthew xxiii, 31), as present and constant and universal : " But that the dead are raised, even Moses shewed . . . He is not the God of the dead, but of the living: for all live unto him " (Luke xx, 37, 38). We may gather that it is by the resurrection of the dead that men are retained as members of the human race in its mortal condition in this present age, continually under the control of God. By the resurrection from the dead the union of the life of the redeemed community with the life of the redeemed individuals will be consummated with eternal life in the Kingdom of God when it shall be openly established by the Son of God in the age to come. And so of all others in due course as they are drawn to him for participation in his life-imparting love. For when God shall be all in all there can be no more death, but life eternal for all his children. And towards this ultimate fulfilment of the purpose of God the return of his Son to reign on earth is a preparatory step.

²*Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament.* By Moulton and Milligan, s.v. *παρουσία*. " The word from Ptolemaic times onward to note the ' visit ' of a king, emperor, or other person in authority."

CO-OPERATION BETWEEN THE MEDICAL PROFESSION AND THE CHURCHES

By A. GRAHAM IKIN

FOR many years this problem has cropped up in various forms, with differing opinions about its advisability, its practicability and the kind of co-operation between doctors and clergy that could make for a fuller ministry to the sick than either profession alone is able to provide.

In connexion with disease we are finding it necessary not only to study the behaviour of disease germs and the course of specific illnesses, but also the reaction or attitude of the whole personality to life. This is as much within the sphere of religion as that of medicine. At present however *each* side tends to distrust the other. The medical profession had a hard fight in the past to get free enough from superstitions associated with religion to approach its subject scientifically, and fears lest any attempt to bring organized religion into the direct sphere of treating disease will involve regression, and not progression.

Some time ago one doctor whose co-operation I was seeking in connexion with the Archbishop of York's Committee of Doctors and Clergy wrote to say that it was impossible, as in his opinion religion in this country was tending to get more infantile and infused with magic, instead of achieving maturity. On the other hand, another doctor said he did not think co-operation was very practicable in our present stage of knowledge and that the real work for the Church was to pray for the conversion of the doctors!

In addition, doctors who have to go through a long and

arduous training rightly fear the intrusion of enthusiastic, well-intentioned, but ill-informed and largely untrained clergy meddling with their patients (untrained medically I mean). Nevertheless the large part played by moral or religious factors (or their absence) in the apparently increasing ranks of mental and nervous disorders makes a real measure of mutual understanding and effective co-operation between doctors and clergy imperative. If sufficient training in psychopathology could be given to clergy to enable them to distinguish the kind of case in which their religious approach may be definitely harmful, where a faulty religious attitude would distort or nullify their efforts, the positive element in their ministry would be far more effective. Co-operation between clergy so trained and psychotherapists or psychiatrists, each passing on cases suitable to the ministry of the other, would be valuable.

The overlap in the sphere of medicine and religion is well illustrated by a statement by the medical superintendent of a mental hospital who was a member of the doctor-clergy group to which I was lecturing on "guilt, normal and pathological". He said, we doctors fail with our patients because we cannot deal effectively with their sense of guilt; and it was in the hope of discovering how to do so that he had thought it worth while joining the study group and bringing two other members of the medical staff with him.

A difference of approach was illustrated in another meeting when a doctor, who was also the medical superintendent of a mental hospital, said that a good deal of his work consisted in removing the sense of guilt of his patients. A bishop who was present said that that was difficult to reconcile with his work, which included awakening a sense of sin. This paradox will be followed up more fully later, as some understanding of it is essential to any effective co-operation between doctors and clergy, who otherwise tend to think each is undoing the work of the other.

Modern medical psychology overlaps into the sphere of general medical practice and that of the clergy. Curing by mental and spiritual means much illness that had previously

been thought to be physical, the medical psychologist inevitably has to deal with moral and religious problems, and throws much light on the effects of a faulty religious attitude in making it impossible for an individual to adjust adequately to the demands of life.

Healing has always been closely associated with religion, from the primitive witch doctors, combining the science and religion of their day, through Aesculapeus and the temple healings, up to the present day, with its spate of queer cults, with a good deal of undifferentiated religious and pseudo-scientific or magical background, which can so upset mental balance and do more harm than good.

This one-sidedness is, however, in part a consequence of the necessary step towards a more scientific understanding of the processes involved in both health and disease on the part of the medical profession, in which the tendency has been to leave out of account the effect of mental and spiritual activities on physical well being. This in turn has led those who realized their importance to minimize or deny the reality of the physical side at all, as in Christian Science, for example.

The separation of the "wholeness" of the primitive witch doctor or medicine man, before his function became differentiated into physician, priest and magician (which was as early as the sixteenth century B.C.) who combined the religious outlook of his tribe and day with whatever knowledge was available—utilizing also the effects of emotion to the full, in terms of fear and hope respectively—into the respectable doctor concerned with our bodies and the equally respectable priest concerned with our souls, has led to an inadequate conception of both souls and bodies. This divergence has led to a separation of the functional unity of mental and physical processes, to ignoring the actual psycho-somatic unity which is so close that we do not yet know whether to speak of body-minds or mind-bodies.

This in turn has led to the development of modern medical psychology in an attempt once more to treat the "whole"

human being, with his physiological processes and his hopes, aspirations, fears and sins on the one hand; and to the revival of interest in the ministry of healing on the part of clergy and others, who have realized that religion must concern itself with the whole man, and not just with his spiritual aspirations or sinfulness.

But the long-continued dichotomy into bodies and minds as if they were completely separate entities, has made it more difficult to see how the mental and the physical processes interact with and react upon each other. No one knows how even the simple "intention" to raise a hand, which is a *mental* activity, sets in motion the complicated *physical* processes through which the actual raising of the hand is carried out. It is possible to give a description of many of the mental processes that led to the "intention" so that it becomes "intelligible" and we think we "understand" it. It is also possible to give a description of the complicated bodily processes that co-operate to bring about that precise action—whether the raising of the hand is in a "salute" or throwing a spear is immaterial and irrelevant. But how to correlate these two "plain tales" so that the complicated mental and physical processes "make sense" *together*, is beyond us, because we have first *divided* the human being into a body and a soul or mind, learning more and more about each in the process, but like killing protoplasm by analysing it into its constituents, missing the reality of the living *human* organism *which combines mental, physical and spiritual activities* into a real and unique unity, a real being.

The rapprochement that is coming to-day through some doctors finding they cannot cure their patients without dealing with personal problems, doubts, guilt, fears, hopes, sins and crimes, which has led to the development of modern psychiatry and psychotherapy, and through some clergy and ministers realizing that when their religion does concern itself with the whole of life, physical results do at times follow their ministrations and prayers, is beginning to bridge this gulf and offers more hope for the future.

It is obvious that co-operation between doctor and priest was impossible if each was supposed to be dealing with distinct and separable "entities"; at best each could only accept the necessity for the other without realizing any overlapping field within which both actually could work together in the fuller interests of those they sought to help. But in the sphere of "disorders of personality", which can issue in physical symptoms, mental imbalance or maladjustment, sins and crimes, doctor and priest really *do* overlap, and neither can be effective without combining something of the approach of the other. There is need for much work on the part of members of both professions to map out this hinterland and rescue it from the "quacks and charlatans" who profit by the failure of religion or medical science to deal sufficiently adequately with the queer happenings in the depths of our minds: and many prejudices on both sides will have to go before full co-operation can be effective in reaching those at present "incurable" by either alone.

The interaction and relevance of both approaches may be shown by the way in which if a priest or psychologist can relieve a pressing load of guilt and help someone to make a fresh start hopefully, the *natural* recuperative processes of the body—the *vis medicatrix naturae*—can function freely, where before the attitude of despair and despondence may have damped them down, exerting a depressing influence on all the bodily functions. (*Cf.* Christ healing the paralytic *after* saying, "Son, thy sins be forgiven thee", and so lifting the load of guilt which was keeping him paralysed.) On the other hand, when the effects of long-continued malfunctioning have affected the organism severely, it is necessary to treat the condition from the physical or surgical side, and the improvement in the physical condition lifts a great burden from the sufferer's mind, which in turn enables it to reinforce the physical.

It would make for close understanding between doctors and clergy if each realized the *complementary* nature of their methods and approach, and could recognize more adequately when someone in a state of acute depression, for example, needs

some psychological help in understanding his failure to adjust to life, or spiritual reinforcement and encouragement to try again, or the removal of some septic focus or the correcting of some glandular deficiency or imbalance, which had set him a harder task than the normally healthy individual ever meets, to which he had succumbed.

Diagnosis is not always easy, since the *secondary* effects of confusing these distinct "needs" so often precedes any real attempt to grapple with the "patient" as a whole, and complicates what might have been more easily differentiated had the right approach been made from the start. Real "cures" form only a comparatively small percentage of the work of doctors and priests or medical psychologists—a percentage that is roughly comparable in the work of the majority in either profession. But many who are "incurable" by one or other, turn out to be "curable" by the other.

This works from both sides. Most doctors will know of cases "incurable" by any means within their power to use, who are either "cured" by some psychological or spiritual healer, or who recover spontaneously: and those who have helped many by psychological or spiritual methods will find some whom they have failed to help, or have made worse, can be helped by medical means.

It is not enough to say someone is "incurable", with all the hopelessness that that entails, if either physical, psychological or spiritual help is left out of account. Sometimes all three methods are needed, sometimes one or two will suffice; but it is important to ensure that the possibility of help on all three, or on *any* of the three levels should be recognized by both doctors and clergy, as well as psychiatrists and psychologists.

Nor is it defensible, as is sometimes done, to say that if a condition previously diagnosed as physical yields to psychological treatment or to prayer, that therefore it could not have been rightly diagnosed and must have been a psychological or spiritual "illness". It may or may not have been wrongly diagnosed; and it is obvious that many "cures" from the

religious approach are claimed with no adequate diagnoses at all, and these cannot be used in evidence. But to *assume* that if the mental or spiritual approach is effective therefore any previous diagnosis on physical grounds *must* have been mistaken is as unscientific as to accept unquestioningly the physical nature of hysterical paralyses, for example, would be, and frequently is, on the part of "spiritual healers".

There *is* no hard and fast line. Under some conditions healing processes can be brought into play via mental and spiritual activities that influence basic physiological functions, and health may be restored. There is plenty of evidence for this in the case-books of medical psychologists; and under hypnosis, for example, the rate of healing of actual burns or wounds can be accelerated. This has been tested with burns on the same patient at the same time, one treated by suggestion under hypnosis, the other left to take its own way. The one treated healed up more rapidly than the other.

Equally we are finding that in serious disturbances of mental and spiritual activities, mental disorders may yield to physical treatment, and in many cases are caused by physical factors—acute infections, for example, or injury to the brain—and no amount of psychological treatment or spiritual exhortation can influence them through the mind of the sufferer.

It is also probably true that there are many conditions that can be affected *either* via the mental or the physical approach. Part of our psycho-somatic "make up" can be activated in this *dual* way, in everyday life and health. Tear glands, for example, may function when some mechanical irritant touches the eye, or in response to emotion. It is probable that some of the conflicts of opinion not only between doctors and clergy, but between different types of medical specialists themselves, arise from this fact. Each man finds the way in which *he* is most effective, and if a different approach produces a similar result he tends to think it *must* have been a different "condition", though the difference may have been in the doctor and not the "patient".

The time is ripe and the need is urgent for some "pooling" of experience, for some real co-operation between doctors and clergy who are mature enough and integrated enough personally to be really "open" to the contribution of the other to the well-being of the real person with whom they are concerned. The bridge *must* be built between the disciplines that kept body and soul as distinct and independent realities and a more comprehensive "science" must be developed to *include* mental and spiritual activities as operative within the "organism" as a whole, within man as a social and personal being; together with a religious attitude that allows for and includes the effects on mental and spiritual activities of physical conditions, both internally or environmentally.

Such an inclusive approach would give a chance to develop and make the best of each individual, instead of overloading so many with a pathological sense of guilt at failing to reach a standard of behaviour that is beyond their capacity, and setting the doctors the task of curing the sense of guilt that their faulty religious attitude itself has engendered.

It *is* of paramount importance to realize the difference between the guilt that is an expression of the failure to be or do something quite impossible for us to be or do, and the healthy "sense of sin" when falling short of what *is* within capacity, short of the best we actually *can* rise to. The latter can inspire us to try again; the former leads to an ever-deepening depression and an inability to do anything at all. The doctor often helps to relieve this because he is not expected to "judge" or "condemn"; whereas the "priest" may stand for the "condemning conscience" and reinforce it beyond endurance, possibly leading to suicide, even if his own attitude is sound, through the primitive "idea" of his "priesthood" and the nature of God in the mind of the patient.

Religion and Psychotherapy, written in 1935 as a plea for co-operation between doctors and clergy, has recently been revised and reprinted as being even more relevant to the needs of the day than when first written. We are all aware that the

times are critical, that something is amiss with our civilization and culture, and there is need for the "healing of the nations" as well as of individuals. And part at least of any such "making whole" depends on bridging the disastrous separation between the physical and the spiritual that is expressed in the prevalence of mental and nervous disorders to-day, and which "infects" international and racial relationships, through the one-sided and unbalanced reactions of the many in need of a real "spiritual healing" who do not even realize that they *are* sick in mind.

The functions of doctors and priests inevitably overlap, hence the great need for mutual understanding so that they reinforce each others' efforts, instead of cutting across them. It is also important to realize that God is not more "active" in so-called "spiritual healing" than in any of his other modes of effecting the relief of sickness. The tendency to look upon the result of "prayer" or the "laying on of hands" as more miraculous than the surgeon's skill or the physician's or psychotherapist's understanding, does no service to religion. Though to deny that prayer has any effect, to "explain away" any such "supposed effects" without real investigation or consideration, is equally immature. Medical psychology has opened the way to a deeper understanding of the part played by mental and spiritual factors in the health of body and mind, and makes co-operation between doctors and clergy more essential than it has ever been before, if the real needs of the sick, physically or spiritually, are to be met adequately. And on a still wider scale such co-operation, with its maturing and developing of both disciplines, is necessary for the more "balanced" and "integral" philosophy of life so essential as a "framework" within which individuals and societies can develop more healthily, and so avoid or greatly reduce the incidence of mental and nervous disease, and play their part constructively in "the healing of the nations" and the winning of a real peace eventually.

REVIEWS

THE CRISIS IN THE UNIVERSITY. By SIR WALTER MOBERLY.
(S.C.M. Press). 15s. net.

SIR Walter Moberly's book, as he explains in the preface, is partly a symposium (or, rather, the result of a symposium), and partly an independent work proceeding from his own mind and thought. It began in discussions conducted by the Student Christian Movement and the Christian Frontier Council—discussions, as Sir Walter says, "among a few Christian University teachers". The discussions ended in the appointment of a committee for the clarification and publication of their results: the committee deputed the work of drafting to Sir Walter; and the work of drafting, in its turn, became the writing of a book, largely based on the results of the previous discussions, but also, and in addition, expressing the writer's own ideas and revealing his own point of view.

There is thus a double quality in the book: it is at once collective and individual. Indeed, there is in the author himself, as well as in the book, a sort of double quality, or ambidexterity. Sir Walter is at once a philosopher and theologian, by virtue of his nature and the tradition of his family, and a university administrator of unparalleled experience, especially in virtue of his long tenure of the office of chairman of the University Grants Committee. Primarily and fundamentally, he writes in the first of these capacities; and he clearly explains in his preface that his book is a personal statement, and in no way and no sense official. On the other hand, he cannot shed a capacity in which he has served for so many years, or the effects upon his mind of his experience in that capacity. When he speaks, in chapter viii, of corporate life and halls of residence, or again (and still more), in chapter ix, of the relation between the University and the State, the reader cannot but feel that he is listening to the voice of a long and large official experience.

Here, and in these pages, we are concerned with the philosopher and theologian—one may almost say with the prophet; for there is a grave prophetic strain in the argument of Sir Walter's book. It has something of the moving force of the prophetic books of the Old Testament: it is at once an indictment (which is

never excessive, but always balanced with scrupulous care), and a call to new faith and new measures (a call which, again, is never strained, but always modest and cautious). Reflecting on the indictment and call, one thinks of Isaiah: reflecting on the balance and caution, one also thinks of Aristotle. Indeed, the references to Aristotle's *Ethics* are frequent; and though the author can criticize what he calls the "Christian-Hellenic" conception of the university, the reader feels that the cast of his mind is itself of that type. But it is far more Christian than Hellenic; and the real plea of his book is a plea addressed to Christian men, in an age of crisis and general doubt, to gather together, to give their testimony (and to encourage others, even their adversaries, to do the like), and to act, in the strength of their testimony, as "a creative minority" which will help to recharge the society in which it moves with the power of principle and purpose. Immediately, the plea is addressed to Christian men in universities, and the crisis which moves the author is "the crisis in the university". Ultimately, as we shall have reason to notice presently, the plea is addressed more generally, and the crisis which causes the plea to be made is a crisis in our whole age, and not only in our universities.

The word "crisis" is a current word; but some of us would prefer the word "problem." To use the word "crisis" is to suggest the notion of haste, and of a life-or-death decision which ought to be made in haste. To use the word "problem" is to suggest the notion of an issue, or set of issues, for which a solution ought to be found, and may be found, *in time*, by a steady effort of inquiry. Using the latter word, because we prefer its suggestion, we may then go on to define the nature of the problem, or set of problems, investigated in Sir Walter's book. In his view it is the problem of finding some view of a principle and a purpose (he uses the term *Weltanschauung*, but that term may wait for further inquiry), by which we may guide our action—in universities and elsewhere—at a time when the stars are obscured and all the old land-marks seem gone. "In universities *and elsewhere*"—those words are used deliberately. The author of *Crisis in the Universities* is really concerned with two problems—the general problem of the age, and the particular problem of universities. The two problems are, no doubt, connected, and even closely connected; but unless they are distinguished, and unless the universities are treated specifically and by themselves, in their own individuality, one may fail to come to conclusions exactly pertinent to their nature and their particular difficulties. It is true that the universities share in the general problem of the age (which is a problem of taking new bearings): it is even true that they

may help, in some degree, and in their measure, to solve it. But we shall be wise, and we shall be kind to the universities as well as wise, if we do not expect too much from them. To demand of them that they should find and pursue a *Weltanschauung* which they could share with, or give to, their age, is to add to the weight of their specific problem, and to add so much that they may be distracted from the solution of that problem.

What is the specific problem of our universities, as such, and in themselves? It is, at the present moment, that they are overcrowded and over-driven. They cannot change their course, or take new bearings, so long as they are overloaded. One may agree with Sir Walter Moberly about the port for which one should steer; but it is necessary, first and foremost, to get into a condition which will enable one to make *any* port. The population of British universities is now nearly twice what it was in 1939. They have come to be filled to overflowing, partly in obedience to the principle of equality, which demands equal access for all who can profit equally, and partly in obedience to the principle of utility, which demands a place in the university for the recruits of almost every profession. The result is to make each university, as it were, a great pantechnicon, crammed to bursting with students, and yet at the same time divided into compartments and specializations which hardly know one another.

What is to be done in this conjuncture? Sir Walter Moberly desires to turn the pantechnicon into a panopticon (to use one of Bentham's terms), with a central room of vision which will give to students and studies a controlling unity. The phrase is an exaggeration; but it may serve to indicate roughly the purpose which he has in mind. Here, however, the issue arises whether there are not some prior things—prior, that is, to the panoptic or synoptic vision—which we ought to begin by considering. If the problem of the universities is congestion, both of students and studies, ought we not to ask ourselves: "What is the proper size of a university (or, in other words, how big can the pantechnicon safely be), and what is the content of studies which it can properly attempt to carry?" If we put those questions to ourselves, we shall be facing the specific problem which confronts the universities. It is, in a word, the problem: "How large can a university be, and yet remain a university?" That is *the* problem which vexes the universities of our time.

There is an argument for limiting the number of students attending each single university—but at the same time increasing the number of universities, in order to ensure admission for every

worthy student. There is similarly an argument for limiting the field of studies in each separate university—but at the same time ensuring that the whole field of possible studies is covered in all the universities when they are taken together. If each university were content with a definite and limited field of study (coupled with a definite and limited number of students), it might begin to see the way to integration and unity. But we must not be too much enamoured of unity and integration. If we are too Platonic, we shall be justly rebuked by the Aristotelians for “excessive unification.” The university, in its nature, is a federation of studies, each of which has its own measure of sovereignty, and each of which represents a “way of approach” to the understanding of truth. There is the “way of approach” of the historian: there is that of the physicist; there is that of the biologist; there is that of the theologian; there are the ways of the chemist, the student of literature, and other types of student. The man who has mastered some way of approach will also attain, *along that way*, some general understanding. He will find that his particular way, if he pursues it far enough, and looks around as he goes, opens out into what Bacon called “philosophy and universality.”

We may thus think of a university federal in its nature, containing a number of sovereign states, or studies, all separate and yet united—separate because each has its own way of approach, but united because all are seeking to gain an understanding of truth. But Sir Walter Moberly's question still recurs: “Should the university not seek to attain the final unity of a common *Weltanschauung*?” Before we face that question, we may permit ourselves to deprecate the use of the term *Weltanschauung*. A *Weltanschauung*, in any strict sense of the term, is a sort of intuitive insight (which may differ from school to school, and even from person to person) into the general significance of the world and of human life in the world. Such an intuitive insight may include—but it may also exclude, as it does for the Marxist—an acknowledgement of the being and operation of God. Sir Walter is seeking something more than this type of intuitive insight. He is anxious for faith. It is a noble anxiety. But how is it to be satisfied? How is the university to “press on the attention of students the urgency of attaining a convincing philosophy of life”? Sir Walter's answer, in brief, is *res redit ad triarios*. The Christian members of each university “should aim at exercising influence on the university as a whole. We should then seek to play the rôle of a ‘creative minority’, from which the whole community may gradually take colour.”

Would such an aim of “exercising influence on the university as a whole,” pursued by its Christian members, produce by way

of reaction a similar aim of its secularist or materialist members, and would the result perhaps be an exacerbation of conflicting parties and a division of the university? It is hard to answer the question. The writer of this article, who has lived in the universities for more than half a century, and who is at one with Sir Walter in fundamental belief, is only clear about two things. One is that he would desire the presence of a Faculty of Theology in every university, pursuing its way of approach by the side of other Faculties, with the same clear rigour of scholarship, in companionship and not contention. The other is that he would desire the presence of a university chapel, open to all but compulsory on none, with a daily service and a regular chaplain, in all our universities. Our schools acknowledge the place of religion in their daily life: "it is now a statutory requirement", as a pamphlet of the Ministry of Education states, "that in all county and voluntary schools, both primary and secondary, the day should begin with a collective act of worship and that religious instruction should be given." What is acknowledged in our schools should surely be also acknowledged in our universities. And I, for one, should be contented with that acknowledgement.

ERNEST BARKER.

CERTAINTY: PHILOSOPHICAL AND THEOLOGICAL. By DOM ILLTYD TRETHOWAN. (Dacre Press.) 15s.

IT must be stated immediately that Dom Illtyd Trethowan has made a profound and valuable contribution to the contemporary rehabilitation of metaphysics, a subject whose "grandeur is that it is wisdom: its misery, that it is human," as Maritain has remarked. Whereas, however, it would probably be true to say that the larger proportion of work which has emerged from the revival of Thomism has been concerned with the validation of ontology, the present volume is concerned with the correlative sphere of epistemology: it is concerned throughout to perform beneficial surgical operations upon the scepticism which has prevailed in modern philosophy. It must also be stated that this is hardly a book for the uninitiated; and its difficulty is perhaps to some extent due to its history. The author tells us in his preface that it was first written some five years ago, and that the version now published is an abridgement of the original draft. "I would ask", he says, "that the book be considered as no more than an outline which I hope to fill in at some future date

if it should prove desirable." This outline is, in fact, largely concerned with the criticism of prevailing theories, which are themselves presented in a very summary form, and tend to presuppose that the reader should have a first-hand acquaintance with the works in which they are expounded.

The book is divided into two parts, concerned respectively with Philosophical and Theological Certainty, as the sub-title indicates. The opening pages of each part make some cogent observations about the present state of these two spheres of inquiry and the relation between them, and again provide clues to the book's intentions and limitations. Thus, in concluding a criticism of Professor Price, who regards metaphysics merely as "alternative modes of conceptual arrangement by which the body of empirical data is systematically ordered", the author claims that "any genuine revival of metaphysics must be based on the principle that it has more than a relative value. Metaphysics makes statements about reality which claim absolute truth" (pp. 4, 5). On the following page, in discussing the scepticism implicit in the coherence theory of truth, he suggests certain excuses for it, such as "the deep-seated mistrust of the senses, the sinister side of the Platonic tradition, which Descartes and his predecessors imposed with such effect. When this is combined with a marked tendency to reduce experience to sensible experience, a sceptical result becomes inevitable." Again, in describing the second and larger part of his book as an exercise in speculative theology, the author remarks: "To say that the truths of faith must be re-thought by every age does not mean merely that these truths must be assimilated by every age and not just learned by rote; it means also that we may require to restore some emphasis which has been lost by previous generations or to make some emphasis which is really fresh, that is, to discover and develop implications, to awaken potentialities which were always there but latent . . . Dogma itself does not develop; but our minds do in penetrating more and more into its meaning" (pp. 64-5). The author believes that "the period stretching from the first age of Thomism to our own time" will be regarded by a future historian as "one of arrested development in speculative theology", being too much concerned with particularities, while the text books in general use require considerable improvement, since their "presentation is often crude and unsympathetic, repulsive rather than attractive." With these convictions so boldly expressed, it is not surprising that we find the author laying current theories under acute criticism.

The character of the book does, however, present the reviewer with certain difficulties. It is clearly impossible, within

the limits of a review, to enter into the debates in which the author has engaged. It must suffice, therefore, to indicate some of the central points which have been made, and to note where these run counter to other opinions on the subject.

The first chapter is concerned with "Certainty in General", and takes note of theories advanced by Price, Reid, Ritchie and Ewing, in the course of which crucial issues involved in the problem of certainty are brought to light: these include the fact that a claim to certainty seems to make it impossible to make mistakes; but it is shown that this actually poses the problem in the wrong way, since knowledge is the datum from which we must start, and it is necessary to ascertain how mistakes are reconciled with it. Thus, "certainty of one's own existence can be questioned in words but not in thought . . . A certainty must guarantee itself. If we require a test for any evidence, this can mean only that in fact we have not recognized it or that we have made inferences from it which do not satisfy us" (pp. 10-11). The account of certainty commonly provided in Thomist manuals (such as that by R. P. Phillips), in which it is divided into "metaphysical or absolute certitude and conditional certitude which is either physical or moral," is brought under review and criticized on account of its implication that knowledge of one's own existence is a contingent truth, and therefore cannot be known with certainty; moreover, this metaphysical certainty of the knowledge of "natures" reduces knowledge to the power to give a definition, with the result that certainty is confused with conceptual clarity. On the contrary, it is argued by the author that "intellect as such is intuitive; it means union with its object, the direct confronting of the subject by a thing, not by its 'idea' but by the *being* of it." This assertion, with which we should agree, is important for the subsequent development of the argument in the rest of the book.

The problem of knowledge is subjected to a more detailed examination in the second chapter, although the author disclaims any intention of providing an outline treatise on epistemology. He is concerned with certain questions about our knowledge of selves and things which must be considered before the question of the certainty of God's existence can be discussed at the end of the chapter. This is the question of the connexion between the levels of our experience and our own bodies, or between sense-knowledge and intellectual knowledge. The Thomist tradition holds that a knowledge of bodily things belongs to a different order from knowledge of immaterial things; and yet knowledge is awareness, and as such is indivisible, so

that it seems that the higher faculty involves the lower: awareness begins in sensation which is also the first stage of intellection. This involves the problem of the distinction between the sensible and the intelligible species, as well as between the material and the immaterial, which is now discussed in the two following sections. The species are interpreted, according to Dr. Hawkins, as the "assimilation of the subject to the object which is required in order that the subject may know something other than itself." Thus it can be argued that knowledge is essentially a becoming and a union, but not a confusion, of subject and object, and is therefore intuitive. The fundamental distinction between the material and the immaterial is the presence or absence of certain limits, and knowledge is a progressive escape from limitation in gaining the object. Matter, in the sense of *materia prima*, is unknowable; but the matter we refer to as objects of knowledge is always something positive with a definite extension, and is therefore an act or form. Such matter is known by bodily contact; but it is in and through our bodies that we know it.

At this point another pair of problems emerges: the one concerns the intuitive perception of the external world, and the other concerns the conceptual form of knowledge. Sensation originates in bodily contact, "but this does not mean that two bodies fuse at some point or points. It means that a relation of causal efficacy is established between them", from which it follows that "we may speak of an intellectual intuition of bodies", although it is a departure from the regular Thomist doctrine. We may now state the conclusion to which the author is approaching. He says:

"Our human (intellectual) awareness bears intuitively on its first (bodily) objects. It is not only some lower activity of a sub-human order which claims this function. The intuitive character of our intelligence at its emergence on the sense level guarantees the objective validity of our further discoveries, of the knowledge of the self which arises from the interplay of the knowledge of 'self' and the knowledge of 'things,' of all that organization of knowledge which is the work of rational discourse" (p. 36).

On the other hand, conceptualism appears to stand in opposition to intuition, as a form of knowledge in which "the intellect seems to construct its objects so as to involve once more the fatal consequence that in knowledge we change reality—that is, we do not know." It is intuitive knowledge, however, which depends upon the vital union of subject and object, and which is synthetic in character, gained piecemeal, the expressed species or concept is the fruit of this union.

We are now introduced to the complementary aspect of the epistemological problem: namely, the problem of being or existence: "Our apprehensions are at the same time affirmations . . . we affirm the existence of finite substances, and in this complex fashion arises the notion of *being*." This affirmation is always implicitly the affirmation of God's existence, according to Aquinas, just as it is the law of knowledge that it should lay hold on God. The question arises here: can we exclude the process of inferential reasoning? The Five Ways are summarized as follows: "if contingent being exists, then necessary being also exists." But this begs the question of the *notion* of necessary being, since a notion "is not a source of knowledge apart from the object or objects from which it is derived"; and it is argued further that the syllogistic form of inference in which the Five Ways are expressed can only play a very limited rôle in the mind's activity, and it is important to note that the doctrine of analogy which is commonly introduced here actually begins its work where the Five Ways end, that is, with the discovery of God (cf. Penido). Here, again, we must state the author's conclusion to this stage of his argument in his own words, and note its affinity with the position adopted by de Lubac:

"We therefore state the essential law of knowledge when we say that it is the 'faculty of being.' It is because God is present to us—in the unique relation of our passivity to his action—that we can know him. . . The knowledge of God in his action upon us is the *final* law of our whole experience. . . . Human awareness reveals itself as conditioned by the use of extended organs; without them it cannot begin its life. But they are only its instruments. Although we need bodies for our purposes we belong to the world of spirits. We are minds, intellects—but not 'pure' intellects; we do not just 'enjoy' reality, but have to make a conquest of it. Pure Being, Infinite Reality, declares itself to us as the source and goal of the intellect and of that sensible world in which human intellects start their unending quest" (pp. 50-1).

The transition from philosophy to theology is almost imperceptible, and is implicit in the conclusion which the first part of the book has endeavoured to establish: "the affirmation of God's existence is necessary", a conclusion in which the author agrees with de Lubac that "it is one with the very life of the thinking being," although subsequently it must clothe itself in conceptual form. This affirmation is at the same time man's choice of his supernatural end by which he enters into a supernatural relationship with God, a relationship which God offers and confirms unless man rejects it. Thus, "'Supernatural know-

ledge' is the knowledge which arises when this relationship has been established, natural knowledge the knowledge which man's power to choose the relationship presupposes" (p. 56); and we are given a further clarification of this view on a later page: "the natural mode of knowledge does not cease to operate when the supernatural makes its appearance. The two modes operate concurrently, and it is only in special circumstances that they will be experimentally distinguishable" (p. 116). We think that Father Trethowan's discussion of the relationship between the natural and the supernatural is one of the most valuable sections of his book. It is followed by the observations on the contemporary state of speculative theology to which we have already referred; and the way is then prepared for the second part of the work: the problem of faith and its certainty.

The act of faith in God's revelation, according to Catholic teaching, is both supernatural and reasonable; it also makes a claim to certainty, but the certainty is "free." Thus, the problem lies in the way in which these statements can be reconciled with one another. We are given an account and criticism of the evidence of faith as it is presented by various writers of the Dominican school (such as Garrigou-Lagrange, Stolz and Chénu) who are then compared with certain Jesuit theologians (notably Billot and Bainvel). Again, it must suffice to quote the author's summary of this study: "although their conclusions may seem to be materially similar, (they) are animated by very different spirits. The Dominican School has provided the materials for claiming not merely that there is a gap in the current analysis of faith but also that the *logical exigencies* of the Thomist tradition lead us in a promising direction. The Jesuit school on the other hand has merely emphasized the gap. The fundamental reason for this is that the Jesuit tradition does not accept the *intrinsically* supernatural character of faith as an essential datum of the problem" (pp. 95-6). A separate chapter is devoted to the views of Rousselot and D'Arcy before the author proceeds to a recommendation of his own theory that "the certainty of faith results from a supernatural knowledge of God as Revealer." Faith is not vision, on the one hand; and it must not be confused with charity, on the other; but as grace is the seed of glory, so the life of faith is the foretaste of the Beatific Vision. Certain objections to this view are answered very briefly, indications which point towards it in other writers are quoted, and the book is brought to a close with a discussion of Christian intellectualism.

Such an outline as this will do less than justice to the learning with which the author has surveyed his field or to the many

topics of discussion which he has suggested. The reader is left with a certain bafflement on closing the book: so many sign-posts have been set up, but it would seem as if the directions have not been fully inscribed upon them, and it is hoped that the writer will give us a more complete exposition in the near future.

R. H. DAUBNEY.

TERTULLIAN'S TREATISE AGAINST PRAXEAS. The text edited with an introduction and commentary by Ernest Evans, pp. viii and 342. (S.P.C.K.). 21s.

Clerus Anglicanus stupor mundi, said a foreign observer of the English clergy in the sixteenth century, and for those who fear that the tradition of the "learned clerk" is dying out, Canon Evans's splendid edition comes as a tonic and a corrective to premature gloom. For a parish priest to turn the hobby of a lifetime to such good advantage is indeed a remarkable achievement, upon which he deserves the warmest congratulations. He should be encouraged to fulfil the promise of further editions of other works of Tertullian made in his preface.

Canon Evans offers a good and up-to-date text enriched by a few suggestions of his own on notorious *cruces* and incorporating many of the emendations made by the late C. H. Turner, a sound translation (no easy matter, for Tertullian's Latinity is highly individual) and a rich and careful commentary. It is a relief to the reader to find the parallels which he quotes given in full. The principal proof-texts of the period are treated *in extenso* with an indication of the extent to which Tertullian's use of them was his own invention or no. Where necessary an indication is given of the manner in which a modern Biblical exegete would interpret the passage. There is an extensive introduction with useful notes on Montanism as the Monarchian movement and especially valuable sections on the terminology of Tertullian and his relations to his predecessors and to later theologians.

The author has in the nature of the case certain limitations of which he is fully conscious. It was possibly exigencies of the press which place text, translation and commentary as it were end on. Some will, like your reviewer, wish that the older form of text and translation opposite to each other with footnotes at the foot and not at the end had been possible, but these are difficult days and it would have been a loss if it had necessitated any

substantial pruning of the commentary. A full bibliography is an extremely valuable adjunct to such an edition but, as Canon Evans disarmingly points out, time and expense forbade the necessary visits to important libraries for this purpose. He suggests the use of the bibliography of Lupton's edition of the *De Baptismo*, which is, however, forty years old and, with all its merits, the *Journal of Theological Studies* cannot really be the sole adequate supplement to Lupton's list. How difficult Canon Evans found the consultation of books is floodlit by the record of his failure to secure de Labriolle's *La crise montaniste*.

It is, however, rather more disturbing to find the editor not really abreast of the modern German treatments of his author. While Canon Evans is fully aware of the dangers of a "modern scholasticism which accepts the brilliant but unproven theories of famous scholars, and proceeds to build upon them an edifice bearing little relation to that which the original documents portray", his neglect of authorities like Harnack and Loofs has left a series of questions raised by the text not sufficiently explained. He does, indeed, deal correctly and in detail with Harnack's rejection (more Ritschliano) of any metaphysical associations of Tertullian's term *substantia*, but, apart from that, the sole reference to Harnack's work is its connexion with "Dynamic Monarchianism" and without regard for the latter stages of the attempt to define more exactly the nature of this particular heresy.

The difficulties into which this neglect of German scholarship leads him can be illustrated by three points:

(i) While rightly rejecting the view that Monarchianism was in any sense a protest against Gnosticism, he rejects on somewhat flimsy grounds the alternative view that Monarchianism represented a protest against the philosophical and pluralist coloration increasingly given in the second century to the term Logos. But this is, after all, strongly suggested by the description given by Epiphanius of the Dynamic Binitarians (Harnack Monarchians) as "a rag of the heresy of the Alogi", and even more by Hippolytus' quotation from Noetus: "John, indeed, calls the Logos Son, but he gives to the term a different meaning" (i.e., from the pluralistically tinged second-century Apologetic tradition). But Monarchianism also claimed, in fact, falsely to represent the old tradition at Rome up to the time of Pope Victor. It attempted a theological vindication, in the mind of its adherents the only possible vindication of two contrasted elements in the Christian tradition, the monarchy of God and the

Christian affirmations about Christ. The *lex orandi* was on their side since, after all, these were the earliest Christian affirmations, but their attempt to theologize upon them led to complications which they themselves perhaps never imagined.

(ii) Dr. Evans does not appear to have probed the concept of "economy" which Tertullian uses to replace the term "monarchy", beloved of the simplices. His linguistic study, agreeing largely with that of Dr. Prestige in *God in Patristic Thought*, notes its functional implications—and yet he appears to find no difficulty in thinking that Tertullian uses it to express an immanent or essential Trinity. If the word really covered what Dr. Evans considers that it did, it is curious that so convenient a term so soon fell out of currency. Nor do the crucial chapters of the treatise (ch. 5-6) really suggest an immanent Trinity. At several points in his exegesis Dr. Evans has to rescue his author from apparent contradictions. There are many elements in the chapters concerned which suggest (if they do not prove) that to some extent Tertullian makes the fullness of the divine plurality dependent upon his manward and creatureward dispensations. The distinction between "ratio" and "sermo", the insistence upon God as *ante omnia solus*, as having the sense *intra semet-ipsam*, all suggest something rather less orthodox in substance as well as in terminology in the thought of Tertullian.

(iii) Dr. Evans doubts whether there existed in the second century (or, indeed, later) a doctrine of the Godhead which might be called Binitarian rather than Trinitarian in character. He recognizes the existence of passages in which the Son and the Spirit appear to be identified. But against the possibility of *theological* as distinct from *devotional* Binitarianism (which certainly never existed) he sets the rather precarious argument that the term "dyad" never occurs in this controversy. While the term is relatively common in the fourth and fifth centuries, it does not seem to occur at all in second-century literature—for the obvious reason that the term *trias* for Trinity was only just beginning to make its presence felt. But the idea seems clearly enough expressed in other ways. The *unus ambo* formula, both of the Monarchians and, apparently, of Tertullian himself, and the charge against the Catholics recorded by Hippolytus, that they were "ditheists", to which the counter-reply only lamely introduces the Holy Spirit, and the battle is essentially fought out on a bi-personal basis. The almost complete silence of the pre-Montanist *regula fidei* of Tertullian about the Holy Spirit tells in much the same direction. Odd as it may appear, a *lex*

credendi Binitarianism seems in many quarters (not all of tainted orthodoxy) consonant with a *lex orandi* Trinitarianism.

It is always the mark of a good book that it suggests further problems which it does not attempt to solve. Canon Evans's work is no exception to this rule. The existence of a *regula fidei* in the second century is clear enough, wider than the Baptismal Creed but still not a complete theology. Was there more than this? At times the editor suggests a common exegetical tradition, certainly standard proof-texts, in the second century. Justin (at least in some respects), Novatian, Hippolytus and Tertullian appear to stand together. How far is this an individual indebtedness and how far the possession with individual differences of a common *traditio credendi*? And what would be the relation, probably more complex or less directly mediated, between Tertullian and such Eastern documents as the letter of the Synod of Antioch which condemned Paul of Samosata.

There are a few minor blemishes. In the introductory account of Tertullian's life and works, it would have been better to have left all titles in the Latin instead of translating some and leaving others in the original. In view of the admitted difficulties over the authorship of the treatise "on the Sublime", was it really worth making the suggestion that the author was indebted for his Biblical information to Paul of Samosata? "Ruffinus" on p. 235 is probably a slip for "Rufinus". The reference to St. Augustine on p. 302, which Dr. Evans has failed to find, is Augustine in Joann Ev. Tract. XLII, 8 (P.L. 35, 1702).

But in comparison with all that Dr. Evans has given us, these are relatively minor defects. He clearly knows his Tertullian extremely well, and allows him to speak for himself. Your reviewer eagerly awaits the further studies in Tertullian of which this is the not inconsiderable earnest.

H. E. W. TURNER.

RELIGION. By NATHANIEL MICKLEM, M.A., D.D., LL.D., Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford. (Home University Library, Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press.) 5s.

DOES our faith in Christ prevent our acknowledging the possibility of genuine religious experiences in other systems of belief? The uncompromising position of the Barthian school seems, at first sight, to be the only one consistent with Christianity

as absolute religion, but there is an ever-increasing number of writers on the Comparative Study of Religions who are unable to stifle the impression that all religion contains much that is genuine and so far true.

Dr. Micklem takes his stand on the latter position in his book on *Religion*, on the ground that religion is "an organic element in common human experience." He points out how "the Mystery Religions and the *bhakti* sects display some of the most beautiful piety and some of the profoundest insights of religious man." Theologies and intellectual interpretations may be many and only too often false, but religion in some sense is a unity. In his very interesting and informative treatise Dr. Micklem investigates the religion in all religions, and has produced, by his own peculiar treatment of the subject, an original contribution to the Comparative Study of Religions.

He expounds and illustrates from both elementary and advanced religions some "fundamental moments in religion" such as (i) the impersonal sacred, (ii) the religion of nature, and (iii) belief in the Most High God. The impersonal sacred is not only seen in Melanesian *mana*, but also in the Hindu *brahman* and the Buddhist *nirvana*. Epicureanism is also placed under the category of the impersonal sacred. The fundamental moment of nature worship links primitive religion with the Chinese *Tao* or the Stoic *physis*, while the Australian high god is not unrelated to the Zoroastrian *Ahura Mazdah* or the God of Plato or even of St. Bonaventura.

The author also surveys certain other types of religious experience: (i) the way of devotion, (ii) religions of will, (iii) prophetic religion, (iv) mysticisms, (v) myth, mime and mystery. Under these headings there is comprised an amazing amount of detail, without loss of clarity or attractiveness, which gives, by the way, many unconventional comparisons of an illuminating character.

The purpose of the book is "not to promote Christian claims but to offer the pattern or ground-plan of religion as it has appeared among men and to show its main developments." The writer does, indeed, indicate the reasonableness of the Christian Gospel and the divine Sonship of Christ, but the book is an empirical study, treating Christianity for the purposes of comparison, as one religion among many, sharing with other religions genuine religious experiences. Such an investigation shows that religions contain more than one type of spiritual experience. These types cut across the religions, weaving and interweaving

themselves in various ways, whereas "we are too apt to parcel men out among the religions of the world, declaring that savages believe this, Hindus that, and Buddhists something else." Indian *bhakti*, for example, finds many a parallel in certain types of piety evoked by adoring reverence for the Person of Christ; on the other hand, religions of will, such as Islam, bear a strong resemblance to Calvinism, and further the prophetic religion of Zoroaster (already linked to the elementary high god) is not unlike that of Amos or Isaiah or even of Jesus, the prophet of Nazareth, though this category would seem clearly inadequate to one of the stature of Jesus.

The chief value of the book, and in no sense a mean one, is the way the author traces these fundamental moments and types of experience throughout both elementary and higher religions, thus indicating lines of unity in them all, rather than following the stock method of presenting each religion as a system or unity of one colour only. While fully recognizing that there is much in non-Christian religions inconsistent with Christianity or of a cruel and horrible character, the author notes frankly that there are genuine religious experiences which cannot be explained away as mere superstitions. "If Judaism and Christianity far outstrip other forms of religion in the seriousness with which they deal with the world as a moral order and with history as the field of divine authority, these conceptions are present, though often overlaid, in other types of religion also." Religions differ in proportion and emphasis, but they are rooted in a common nature.

Can we then speak of Christianity as the crown of all religion as Farquhar spoke of Christianity as the "Crown of Hinduism"? We are faced with the difficulty that Christianity, on the one hand, is a motley variety of denominations, and that the non-Christian religions, on the other hand, contain much that is not true religion. Besides, traditional authoritative interpretations tend to nullify the genuine intuitions of individual adherents. Hinduism, for example, as a tradition presents "the chill persistent undertone of the vast orchestra of the conviction of illusion, of the vanity of life, of the meaninglessness of all existence." Nevertheless Christianity can be said to crown non-Christian religion as fulfilling the aspirations and purifying the partial insights of Hinduism as of other religious experiences: so satisfying the reason and heart of man. In this sense Christianity is, in principle, not one religion among many but religion itself. We need not, therefore, be afraid of recognizing religion in all religions, any more than did St. Paul when he wrote of the Gentile

world "Whatever is to be known of God is plain to them; God himself has made it plain—for ever since the world was created, his invisible nature, his everlasting power and divine being, have been quite perceptible in what he has made." (Romans i, 19 foll.)

Setting aside, finally, primitive forms of religion as embryonic and mysticisms as too esoteric and private, Dr. Micklem classifies religions as (a) of reason and (b) of revelation. The former affirm by reason a supreme moral and beneficent Ruler, the latter, through "myth", offer man some kind of redemption. Christianity is of chief significance not only because of its systematic and critical use of reason, but also because, as a redemptive religion rooted in history, it commends itself as "the myth come true." To eliminate the elements which make up the Gospel narrative as unhistorical and legendary leaves us with no intelligible alternative account of the origins of the Gospels. But if the myths, for example, of Orphism, had no ground whatever in religious truth, then would Christianity appear in an inexplicable vacuum. "Was Orphism pure illusion or was it pointing towards the truth? In the latter case, the Christians would not be irrational in their claim that in Jesus Christ the ancient myth became reality."

But we cannot stop at that point, religion is not a matter of theoretic comparison only. To accept Christianity, or, for that, any other genuine belief, a man must experience "some inward touch of the heavenly fire at once incommunicable to others and self-evidencing to him."

We welcome very heartily this sympathetic approach to the basic character of religious experiences in non-Christian religions. Because man's "super-natural environment—better called God—is one, there is a unity in religion amid all the diversities and divagations of the various religions." The Barthian solution fails because if the Christian revelation is so unique that it speaks in a tongue entirely foreign to the aspirations and experiences of a common human nature, it would be unintelligible magic. Apart from this fact, it is difficult to reconcile with Christianity, the assumption that the Heavenly Father, having loved children into life to respond to his own holy love, had then left countless numbers of them, because of their fallen nature, in complete ignorance of himself.

Any criticism of detail does not in any way detract from the worth of this book, which is a general treatise valuable mainly for its broad insights, especially as our criticism is on debatable points.

One wonders whether "potentially personal" is not a better interpretation of mana than "impersonal." "Im-personal" as the contradictory of the term "personal" can only have meaning where there is a clear conception of personality, and it is questionable whether the native has any clear idea of "person or not-person." Even Codrington speaks of mana as "always connected with some person who directs it", or "a spirit has associated itself with it" (*The Melanesians*, pp. 116-119), and the word animatism (alive in a world alive) suggests potential personality rather than impersonality. Its so-called parallel *wakanda* of the Siouans is not infrequently personified and addressed in prayer (Skinner, Siouans E. R. E.); and regarding the Iroquoian *orenda*, Hewitt (*American Anthropologist*, New Series IV, 1902) wrote that the "story of the operations of *orenda* becomes the history of the gods" who possess it.

We are on more difficult ground concerning *brahman*, but Hinduism becomes far more comprehensible if we regard the Hindu as groping for a higher life than limited human personality, and treat *brahman* as an attempt to express the ground of personality rather than to regard it as merely the contradictory of personal. "Brahman is intelligence" for "all this universe is guided by intelligence, is based on intelligence" (*Aitareya Upanishad*, 3, 5, 3). And Buddhism, especially the founder, becomes far more intelligible if nirvana ("bliss unspeakable") is interpreted as a straining after a supra-personal experience rather than for impersonality. The Sacred Canon is indeed confusing and contradictory. But the *Milinda-panha* is outside the Canon and as reflecting later scholasticism ought not to be quoted for primitive Buddhism. The Canon itself presents developing views ranging from the sixth to the third centuries B.C., and it was oral till the first century B.C., except for a limited number of inscriptions. It would be preferable, however, to quote the canonical *Anatta-lakkhana-sutta* to the uncanonical *Milinda-panha* for Gautama's views. The former states that the self must not be identified with the body, nor with feeling, nor perception and so on, because man is free and these are not, so leaving the door open to a higher life of free choice, rather than a denial of the self outright.

Finally we should not feel disposed to isolate the pygmies from other elementary races as privileged examples of primitive or primaeval religion, in view of the strong feeling of ethnologists (Cf. von Eickstedt and Felix Speiser) that pygmies are degenerates of surrounding taller races. Our own study of the

most elementary races generally leads us to the conclusion that the most elementary religion is a dualism, not necessarily anti-thetic, of kindly and terrifying powers potentially personal. McDougall, in his *Social Psychology* (21st Edition, p. 116), seems to have caught its spirit in the words : "primitive religion seems to have kept separate the superhuman objects of its component emotions, the terrible or awe-inspiring powers, on the one hand, the kindly beneficent powers that inspire gratitude on the other."

F. HAROLD SMITH.

MARCION AND HIS INFLUENCE. By E. C. BLACKMAN. Pp. x and 181. (S.P.C.K.) 12s. 6d.

THE appearance of this book from the pen of a Free Church scholar is a welcome sign of the recent revival in Patristic Studies in all parts of the Christian Church. It is a mark of no little courage that Mr. Blackman should enter a field which the great Harnack had for so many years made so peculiarly his own.

The time was, however, ripe for a revision of some of the more trenchant of Harnack's judgements.

(1) The study of Gnosticism had made considerable strides since Harnack's superficial description of it as "the acute Hellenization of Christianity" in directions which inevitably demand a reconsideration of the question whether Marcion was not himself more closely related to Gnosticism than Harnack was prepared to accept.

(2) The relation of Marcion to Paulinism was neither in principle nor in detail as clear as Harnack made out. To call Marcion a Pauline reformer with more than half an eye on Luther is to do justice neither to Paul nor to the Reformers. Marcion might indeed claim the "cover" of Paulinism; it is more than doubtful how far such a claim can be completely justified.

(3) The connexion between Marcion and the "great Church" is again not as simple as Harnack maintained. Mr. Blackman examines with great thoroughness the suggestions that the Church's organization was a "counter-organization", the Church's text of Scripture a modified Marcionite Bible, the Church's Canon a Counter-Canon, the Church's Creed a polemical *regula fidei*. The first suggestion he dismisses as without serious foundation; the second (breaking in his careful tabular

presentation of the evidence ground not covered adequately by Harnack) as true only within very narrow limits; the third as half-truth (the Church's Canon would have been evolved even without Marcionite or other heretical stimulus, though doubtless the process was accelerated by the questions raised by the *Auseinandersetzung* of heresy and orthodoxy); the fourth as true only within very narrow limits (modern credal study has emphasized as against scholars of Harnack's generation the place of the Creeds as positive explications of the Christian *lex orandi*). Even where Harnack had some factual support, he ignored the part played by other heretical movements like Montanism and Monarchianism in providing the stimulus for such developments as occurred within the Great Church).

The book is full of interesting studies of particular questions. The relation of Marcion to Cerdon, the problem whether Marcion's second God was evil or merely judicial, the various ways in which the Old Testament was treated in the Early Church all receive full and illuminating treatment. He is well abreast of recent literature, and devotes appendices to the more controversial post-Harnackian contributions to his subject. The book is well-documented despite its commendable brevity.

Its least successful feature is its effort to translate Marcion's *aperçus* into modern terms. Such intellectual translations are rarely convincing and in the state of our evidence about Marcion particularly temerarious. The *obiter dictum* in note 4 on p. 98 "A Logos-Christology may easily become modalist", in the light of the normal association of such a Christology with cosmology and its pluralist connotations, seems peculiarly misleading. Something has come badly adrift with the printing of the penultimate line of p. 18.

But such minor blemishes apart, the book remains a noteworthy contribution to the study of Marcion, in particular the relation between orthodoxy and heresy in general, and its detailed treatment of textual points will make it worthy of the attention of the textual critic of the New Testament as well as of the Church historian and the historian of Christian doctrine.

H. E. W. TURNER.

THE BIBLICAL THEOLOGY OF ST. IRENAEUS. By JOHN LAWSON. pp. xv and 306. (Epworth Press). 21s. 6d.

ONE of the most heartening trends of the last few years has been the entry into the field of the history of Christian Thought of

Free Church scholars. Mr. Lawson, who is a Methodist by Church background, continues this tradition and he is happy in his subject.

St. Irenaeus marks rather a cross-road in the history of Christian Thought. Faced with counter-traditions in the interpretation of the New Testament data, he framed his answer less in terms of any philosophical system which might afford a firm scaffolding for a doctrinal system than by a reaffirmation of the Christian *lex orandi* itself. He is, for this reason, the last Church father to commend himself to that staunchly anti-metaphysical historian of dogma, Adolf Harnack. He represents possibly the last clear point at which the Biblical character of early Christian theology is clearly discernible. A work on the Biblical theology of St. Irenaeus was therefore overdue, and Mr. Lawson makes a gallant attempt to supply the need.

His general thesis is a criticism and rejection of the views of scholars like Werner and Beuzart who, interpreting Paulinism along the lines of the Continental Reformation, find in St. Irenaeus a regrettable declension from earlier undiluted Paulinism. It is much to Mr. Lawson's credit that he does not apply such exacting standards to the Paulinism of St. Irenaeus, and though, at times, he appears to be only too anxious to give his author the benefit of the doubt, his critique is fair and honest enough.

The weakness of the study seems to me to lie rather in his appraisal of the other elements in St. Irenaeus. Granted that he, like virtually every other father of this period, is a "man of one book", the traditional factor in his thinking is only partially accounted for by being described as biblical. Just as in his discussion of Canonicity Mr. Lawson does not seem to give sufficient weight to the factor of Church reception, in his general thesis he fails to take sufficient account of the total data of the Christian *lex orandi*. While this has a firm Biblical basis, by the time of St. Irenaeus, Christian traditional ways of thinking had become fastened upon the biblical data; emphases and stresses which are not mere repetitions of the biblical data but, as it were, a set of variations upon biblical themes. It is this missing factor in Mr. Lawson's work that raises the kind of problem which presses upon any attempt to explain it only as a biblical system. The Paul to whom he is indebted is neither the Reformation Paul nor the Apostle of the Gentiles *tout simple*; he is Paul seen through the eyes of the collective experience of two centuries of Christian living by men to whom St. Paul was not the only interpreter.

Mr. Lawson also calls attention to other elements in the thought of St. Irenaeus which derive less from his biblicism than from his place within the series of Christian Apologists. He rightly observes that this is not so fundamental to his general work, but it must certainly be taken into account. He is probably right in rejecting the theory of Loofs that these strands do not represent traditions which he inherited, or sources from which he drew. As worked out by Loofs, these theories become too schematic to be tenable.

The truth is, as Mr. Lawson fully sees, that St. Irenaeus had not, and perhaps never attempted too rigorously to construct, a synthesis. Elements of different patterns stand side by side in his writings in a manner which make his importance quite unquestionable. In him the Church mustered all its resources against Gnosticism, the positive explication of its *lex orandi*, its basic biblical theology, its slender philosophical equipment, its sense of the inadequacy of other formulations to express its own *lex orandi*, its apprehension of the inner contradictions and essential incongruities of Gnosticism with the Christian data.

The bibliography is good and has been well and carefully used. The reader is occasionally irritated by a careful (but unnecessary) abstract of some of the books concerned. Is it really necessary in such detail to offer a *résumé* of Dr. Anderson Scott's well-known *Christianity according to St. Paul*? Not everyone would accept the interpretation of Gnosticism given on pages 119-20, and Mr. Blackman's recent book may well lead to a revaluation of the judgement of Marcion made upon p. 27. I am personally less inclined to value the Trinitarian theology of St. Irenaeus as orthodox as Mr. Lawson makes out. There is more to be said in favour of an economic doctrine of the Trinity in at least some passages than Mr. Lawson would admit. Nor can I find in the doctrine of the Two Hands of God all the excellence that Mr. Lawson does. It is in some respects singularly misleading, if it means all that he implies. But these are largely matters of opinion, and Mr. Lawson has shown himself well able to maintain his chosen positions with competence, if not always with complete plausibility.

Despite disagreements on some of its presuppositions and occasional failure to agree on points of interpretation, I find the book a competent detailed study of a subject not previously dealt with on any comparable scale in English Patristic literature. The width of Mr. Lawson's approach is phenomenal, his knowledge of St. Irenaeus profound, his biblical scholarship living and sen-

sible. If only he could have matched these admirable qualifications for his task with a clearer and more imaginative grasp of the character, principles and objectives of the second-century Church, he would have put us still further in his debt.

H. E. W. TURNER.

PERIODICALS

The Journal of Theological Studies (Vol. L. Nos. 197-8. January-April, 1949. Cumberlege). J. Jeremias: The Last Supper. G. D. Kilpatrick: Three Recent Editions of the Greek N.T. [Nestle, Souter, Merkl]. N. Sykes: Some Current Conceptions of Historiography and their Significance for Christian Apologetic. A. M. Honeyman: Two Contributions to Canaanite Toponymy. I. Elteque', Elteqeh and Elteqon; II. "Talpioth." O. Chadwick: Gregory of Tours and Gregory the Great. A. Guillaume: A Note on Judges vi, 25, 26, 28 ["Take thy father's bullock, the full grown beast of seven years old."]. D. Daube: Two Notes on the Passover "Haggadah": (a) A Trace of a Jewish Legend of a Virgin Birth; (b) *Ego eimi*. T. C. Skeat: St. Mark xvi, 8. A Modern Greek Parallel. W. G. Wilson: The Original Text of the Fourth Gospel. R. V. G. Tasker: The Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Apocalypse of John. S. T. Collins: Corruptions in Christian Latin Poetry. C. S. C. Williams: Aphraat on St. Peter. Professor Ernst Lohmeyer. D. G. M. Stalker: Snaith, *The Jewish New Year Festival*; Wheeler Robinson, *Two Hebrew Prophets*. H. H. Rowley: North, *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah*. J. Y. Campbell: Duncan, *Jesus, Son of Man*. C. K. Barrett: Headlam, *The Fourth Gospel as History* (critical). E. G. Selwyn: Manson, *The Church's Ministry*. S. L. Greenslade: Waszink (ed.), *Tertulliani "De Anima"*. J. Hussey: Dawes and Baynes, *Three Byzantine Saints*. E. F. Jacob: Kemp, *Canonization and Authority in the Western Church*. O. Chadwick: Ullmann, *The Origin of the Great Schism*. Dom L. Brou: Andrieu, *Le Pontifical Romain au Moyen-Age*, II.-IV. R. W. Southern: Knowles, *The Religious Orders in England*. G. R. Owst: Mourin, *Six Sermons francais inédits de Jean Gerson*. A. G. Dickens: Rupp, *Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Tradition*. C. W. Dugmore: Dix, *Dixit Cranmer et non Timuit*. C. C. J. Webb: Rust, *The Christian Understanding of History*; Baillie, *God was in Christ*; Farrer, *The Glass of Vision*. L. W. Grensted: Farmer, *God and Men*. R. H. Daubney: Thelen, *Man as Sinner in Contemporary American Realistic Theology*. R. W. Hunt: Weitzmann, *Illustrations in Roll and Codex*. T. W. Thacker: Plumley, *Introductory Coptic Grammar, Sahidic Dialect*. Corrigendum.

The Journal of Religion (Vol. XXIX. No. 2. April, 1949. University of Chicago Press). J. E. Smith: Religion and Morality. N. P. Jacobson: Marxism and Religious Naturalism. R. T. Handy: The Influence of Mazzini on the American Social Gospel. E. J. Chave: Religious Education in a Liberal Seminary. R. P. Casey: Contemporary Russian Philosophy. S. E. Mead: Wertenbaker, *The Puritan Oligarchy*. F. L. Baumer: Rupp, *The Making of the English Protestant Tradition*. S. E. Mead: Pye, *Bosworth of Oberlin and The Christian Religion and Human Progress*. C. Bergendoff: Dun, *Prospecting for a United Church*. P. T. Fuhrmann: Larsen and Scherz, *Nicolai Stenonis Opera theologica*. J. W. Beardslee: Smith, *The Jesus of the Parables*. G. Johnston: Cullman, *Die Tauflehre des N.T.* A. B. Rhodes: Goldman, *The Book of Books*. J. Haroutunian: Richardson, *Christian Apologetics* (critical). J. H. Cotton: Lewis, *The Creator and the Adversary*. J. Wach: De Grazia, *The Political Community*. M. S. Friedman: Buber, *Israel and the World*. W. H. Bernhardt: Eklund, *Die Wurde der Menschheit*. J. C. Bennett: Aulen, *Church, Law and Society*. D. Knight: Davies, *The Theology of William Blake*. W. H. Blakeman, jr.: Harkness, *Prayer and the Common Life*. S. Hiltner: Bonthius, *Christian Paths to Self-acceptance*. W. A. Christian: Steiger, *Christian Science and Philosophy*. G. Heard: Phillips (ed.), *The Choice is always Ours*. A. K. Reischauer: Ward, *Buddhism*.

The Congregational Quarterly (Vol. XXVII. No. 2. April, 1949. London, E.C.4: Memorial Hall). N. Goodall: Amsterdam and the Missionary Societies. N. Cunliffe-Jones: Annas and Sapphira. A. J. B. Higgins: Some Recent Trends in Biblical Scholarship. C. Mackay: The Phoenix Land. H. J. Cowell: John Winthrop (1588-1649), the Father of New England. D. W. Langridge: Charles I—the Nonconformist Answer. E. L. Allen: Existentialism and Christian Faith. H. Klitscher: Our Common Needs. G. F. Nuttall: Smith, *Sonship*; Dunkley, *The Reformation in Denmark*; Moss, *The Old Catholic Movement*. R. S. Franks: Farrer, *The Glass of Vision*; Vine, *An Approach to Christology*. A. V. Murray: Ullmann, *The Origins of the Great Schism*. S. Cave: Lecerq, *Introduction to Reformed Dogmatics*. E. Routley: Rattenbury, *Eucharistic Hymns of John and Charles Wesley*. J. Marsh: Toynbee, *Civilization on Trial*. A. J. B. Higgins: Easton, *The Pastoral Epistles*.

Bibliotheca Sacra (Vol. 106. No. 422. April-June, 1949. Dallas Theological Seminary). L. S. Chafer: The Riches of Divine Grace, II. J. F. Walvoord: Postmillennialism. M. F. Unger: (a) The Temple Vision of Ezekiel, II; (b) Archeology and the Israelite-Aramaean Wars. J. H. Ben-netch: II Tim. iii, 16a. M. B. Stearns: A Conservative interviews Barth. H. L. Payne: Contemporary Amillennial Literature. G. E. Cairns: The Theology of "Paradise Lost," II. L. P. Moore jr.: Darkness and the Light. E. F. Harrison: The Son of God among the Sons of Men, II. P. W. Grossmann: Jewish Anticipation of the Cross. M. F. Unger: Murphy Study of Psalm 72 (71) [Laudatory]; Gaspar, *Social Ideas in the Wisdom of the O.T.* (favourable); Goldmann, *The Books of Books*. Jones (ed.), *The Church, the Gospel and War*.

Theological Studies (Vol. X. No. 1. March, 1949. Baltimore, 2, Md.: Mt. Royal and Guilford Avenue). B. J. F. Lonergan: The Concept of *Verbum* in the Writing of St. Thomas Aquinas, IV. J. T. Mangan: An Historical Analysis of the Principle of Double Effect. L. E. Sullivan: The Gates of Hell (Matt. xvi, 18). J. L. Monks: The Orthodox Churches and Anglican Orders. G. Kelly: Notes on Moral Theology, 1948. W. A. Huesmann: Many, *De Ratione Peccati Poenam Aeternam inducentis* (5 pp. critical). C. de Muth: Doronzo, *De Eucharistia, II*. L. E. MacGuignan: *Les Etats intersexuels*. F. J. Connell: Gemelli, *La Fecondazione Artificielle*. J. Duhamel: Bon, *La Mort et ses Problèmes*. W. G. Heidt: Hundstorfer, *Die Adressaten des I Korintherbriefes*. J. T. Griffin: Cadbury, *Jesus: What Manner of Man*. G. Weigel: Bardy, *La Question des Langues dans l'Eglise Ancienne, I*. E. A. Ryan: Ward, *Young Mr. Newman*. G. C. Ring: Dirks, *The Critical Theology of Theodore Parker*. F. X. Lawlor: Aulen, *Church, Law and Society*. L. Sullivan: Tillich, *The Protestant Era* (6 pp.). F. A. Harkins: Molien, *Le Cardinal Bérulle*. L. A. Hogue: Bizet, *Henri Suso et le Déclin de la Scholastique*.

The Expository Times (Vol. LX. Nos. 7-8. April-May, 1949. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark). J. Baker: The Christological Problem. T. T. Rhys: Man or Machine? E. F. F. Bishop: "Prasiai" and "Pleromata." F. Bussby: Bishop Jebb. E. F. Sutcliffe: Camels' Feet in the Vulgate Text of Genesis xxiv, 32? W. Powell: Luke x, 9, 11. J. K. Russell: "The Sons of Mary" (Mark vi, 3). Snaith, *I believe in*. Way, *Man's Quest for Significance*. A. M. Hunter: Easton, *The Pastoral Epistles*. W. D. Niven: Floss, *The Old Catholic Movement*; Dewick, *The Gospel and Other Faiths*. A. D. Alexander: Barker, *The Johannine Epistles*. H. H. Rowley: Recent Foreign Theology. May. K. Harper: Christ, the Word. E. L. Allen: Karl Barth on Man. C. E. Cook: Paul the Christian. C. F. D. Moule: E. J. Goodspeed's Theory regarding the Origin of Ephesians. J. P. Wilson: Note on the Textual Problems of Ephesians, i, 1. G. Ogg: The Year of the Exodus in the Pseudo-Cyprianic De Pasha Computus. H. Ainsworth:

"Drake's Prayer." Lewis, *Transposition*. Urquhart, *Humanism and Christianity*. W. Fuller : Vine, *An Approach to Christology*. C. E. B. Cranfield : Torrance, *The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers*. N. MacNicol : Jones, *Mahatma Gandhi*. R. W. Stewart : Tomkins, *The Wholeness of the Church*.

Biblica (Vol. 30. Fasc. 1. 1949. Rome : Piazza Pilotta, 35). J. M. Vosté : Le Prophète promis par Moïse d'après Mar Iso'dad de Merw (c. 850), Deut. xviii, 15-19. G. Messina : Lezioni apocriefe nel Diatessaron persiano. H. Schneider : Die biblischen Oden im christlichen Altertum, I. E. F. Sutcliffe : Notes on Job, Textual and Exegetical. J. Van Dodewaard : Die sprachliche Uebereinstimmung zwischen Markus-Paulus und Markus-Petrus, I. N. Schneider : Aram u. Aramäer in der Ur III-Zeit. G. R. Castellino : *La Sacra Bibbia*, III. S. Lyonnet, S.J. : May, *Ecce Agnus Dei* ... John i, 29-36. A. G. da Fonseca, S.J. : Ceuppens, *De Mariologia Biblica* (7 pp.). P. Nöber, S.J. : Schreitber (ed.), *Semitic Studies in Memory of Immanuel Löw*. Elenchus Bibliographicus Biblicus.

Collectanea Theologica (Vol. XXI. F. 1. 1949. Varsaviae (Polonia)). Necrologium —A. Bukowski; S. Kolzecki. A. Pawlowski : De Doctrina Assumptionis Deiparae definienda quaestiones selectae. M. Godlewski : Un Episode dans l'Histoire du Grand Séminaire de Varsovie en 1831. S. Kowalski : Le Problème de la Descente du Christ aux Enfers dans la I Epître de St. Pierre. B. Jankowski : Schola "Historiae Formarum" quid de Resuscitationibus evangelicis sentiat ? R. Paciorewski : Les Commencements de l'Empirisme ecclésiologique dans les Méthodes de l'Apologétique contemporaine. W. Kwiatkowski : Seiterich, *Wege der Glaubenbrgründung nach der sogenannten Immanenza politik*. F. Sawicki : Kwiatkowski, *Apologetyka totalna*. J. Iwanicki : Chojnacki, *Filozofia tomistyczna neotomisty Ezna*.

Revue D'Histoire Ecclesiastique (Vol. XLIV. Nos. 1-2. 1949. Louvain : Bibliothèque de l'Université). F. Clandon : Un Condominium ecclésiastique. Pairie épiscopale et juridiction capitulaire. H. Silvestre : Notes sur la *Vita Euraci* de Renier de Saint-Laurent. A. Fliche : Innocent III et la Réforme de l'Eglise. O. Lottin : Le Commentaire sur les Sentences de Jean de Murro est-il trouvé ? J. de Ghellinck : Magister Vacarius. Un Juriste theologian peu aimable pour les Canonistes. J. Imbert : La Centralisation administrative de Joseph II et les Etablissements hospitaliers belges, 1787-9. J. Leclercq : Une nouvelle édition des oeuvres de Saint Bernard. J. Coppens : Sahlín, *Der Messias und das Gottesvolk*. A. Descamps : Huby, *Mystiques paulinienne et johannique*. J. Zeiller : Bardy, *La Question des Langues dans l'Eglise ancienne*, I. J. Gijssels : Holsapple, *Constantine the Great* (critical). J. de Ghellinck, S.J. : De Plinval, *Le Style et la Langue de Pélagie*. J. Lebon : Schmidt, *Die Christologie Isidors van Pelusium*. Dom L. Robert : Bardy, *L'Eglise et les derniers Romains*. G. Bardy : Courcelle, *Histoire littéraire des grandes invasions germaniques*. G. Garitte : *Mémorial Louis Petit*; Dawes and Baynes, *Three Byzantine Saints* (4½ pages : critical). P. Debongnie : Satan. A. Ruiz : David, *La Galice at le Portugal du VIe au-XIIe Siecle*. Dom H. Dauphin : I. C. H. Cambridge O. Jodogne : Vincent, *Que Signifient nos Noms de Lieux ?* (laudatory). Dom H. Dauphin : Hunt-Pantin-Southern, *Studies in Mediæval History presented to F. M. Powicke*. Dom P. Chauvin : Dvornik, *The Photian Schism*. Don P. Meyvaert : Evans, *Art in Mediæval France, 987-1498* (3½ pp.). Dom Y. Ricaut : Delattre, *Les Etablissements des Jésuites en France depuis quatre siècles*, fasc. 4. F. Combaluzier : *Martyrologium Romanum* (8 pp.). A. Louant : Belvederi, *Guido Bentivoglio diplomatico*. J. de Ghellinck, S.J. : Yates, *The French Academies of the Sixteenth Century*. P. Asveld : Larsen and Scherz, *Nicolai Stenonis Opera theologica*. J. Hamer :

Hök, *Zinzendorfs Begriff der Religion*. P. J. H. Walgrave : Gorce, *Le Martyre de Newman*. L. de Laeger : Combes, *L'Abbe Biot* (1863-1936). A. Van Hove : Rivière, *Le Dogme de la Rédemption dans la Théologie contemporaine*. Dom J. Higgins : Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*. Dom H. Dauphin : Pantin, *Durham Cathedral*; Hole, *English Folk Heroes*; McNeile, *Christianity in Southern Fenland*. Dom P. Meyvaert : Pevsner, *Outlining European Architecture*. Davies, *Episcopal Acts relative to Welsh Dioceses, 1066-1272*. Bouch, *History of the Diocese of Carlisle*. Ullmann, *Origins of the Great Schism*. Roberts, *St. George's Chapel, Windsor Castle*. Smith, *Henry VIII and the Reformation*. Brace, *The First Minute Book of the Gainsborough . . . Society of Friends, 1669-1719*, I. Carpenter, *Thomas Tenison*. *Bibliographie* (208 pp.).

Nouvelle Revue Théologique (Tome 71. Nos. 3-4. March-April, 1949. Tournai : Castermann). E. Bergh : Le Vicaire du Christ. A l'Occasion d'un double Anniversaire. 2 Avril 1899-2 Mars 1939. L. Malevez : La Vision chrétienne de l'Histoire, II. Le Conférence de Lambeth de 1948. G. Lambert : Les Manuscrits découverts dans le Désert de Juda, I (April II). J. M. P. Bauchet : Notes sur les Variantes de Sens d'Isaïe 42 et 43 dans le MS. du Désert de Juda. Actes du Saint-Siège. J. de Ghellinck : Jones, *Bedae Opera de Temporibus*; Landgraf, *Einführung in die Geschichte der theologischen Literatur der Frühscholastik*; Schmitt, *S. Anselmus. Opera Omnia, II-III*; Dhont, *Le Problème de la Préparation à la Grace. Débuts de l'Ecole franciscaine*; Blum, *St. Peter Damian*; Leclercq, *La Spiritualité de Pierre de Celle*; Lecamp et Bonnes, *Jean de Fécamp*; Petit, *La Spiritualité des Prémontrés aux XII^e et XIII^e siècles*; Wilmart, *Le Jubilus dit de Saint Bernard*; Grabmann, *Die theologische Erkenntnis, und Einleitungslehre des hl. Thomas von Aquin auf Grund seiner Schrift in Boetium de Trinitate*, IV; Moos, *S. Thomas d'Aquin Scriptum super sententiis, IV*; Wilson, *The Stella Maris of John of Garland*; Nardi, *Nel Mondo di Dante*. April. J. Coppens : Les Harmonies des Deux Testaments, III. H. Duméry : De l'Athéisme contemporain. P. Broutin : Monsieur Vincent au Service de l'Episcopat. R. Thibaut : Pourquoi n'y a-t-il plus d'Antipape ? Un surprenant cinquième Centenaire. R. Plus : Mauriac et la Pierre d'Achoppement. M. et L. Becqué : Chair et Esprit. E. de Moreau : La Nouvelle Edition du Martyrologe Romain (1948). Actes du Saint-Siège. R. Verneaux : La Providence des Cités. E. de Moreau : Wand, *The Spirit of Church History*; Hughes, *History of the Church, I-II*. Schmitz, *Histoire de l'Ordre de Saint Benoît, III-IV*; Ullmann, *Origins of the Great Schism*; Orcibal, *Les Origines du Jansénisme, I-III*. C. Mertens : Rollin, *L'Action Social des Catholiques de France (1871-1901)*.

Kyrkohistorisk Arvsskrift (11948. Uppsala : Almqvist & Wiksells). S. Gagnér : Zur Entstehung der europäischen und der schwedischen Diözesansynode. R. Ridelius : Birger Jarls ställning till Skenninge möte 1248. S. Göransson : Sverige och de synkretistiska striderna i Tyskland 1649-54. L. Hagberg : Johannes Gezelius d. y. och engelsmännens religionsfrihet i Narva 1684. A. Sanderwall : Till frågan om herruhutismens betydelse för norrlandsläseriets uppkomst. G. Petré : En oberfordrad prästmans inkomster par 1850-och 1860-talen. H. Crafttingius : Författarskapet till Uppsala mötes D-Källa. O. Löfgren : Pakomius etiopiska Klosterregl. F. Stegmüller : Der Sentenzenkommentar des Rostocker Magisters Bernardus Wissel de Indagine. T. Schmid : Förbönslängder från det medeltida Sverige. N. Jacobson : Aktstycken och brev till belysande av överhordpredikanten d. r. Carl Magnus Wrangels och Samfundet Pro Fides äldsta historia. *Reviews*.

Orthodoxia (Vol. XXIII. Nos. 11-12. November-December, 1948. Istanbul). Dorotheus Abp of Prinkeponnesi : The Election of the new Oecumenical Patriarch. The Patriarchal Election. His Christmas and New

Year Letter. Abp. Dorotheus : Christmas. Gennadius Abp. of Heliopolis : Bossuet, II. Germanus Metropolitan of Thyateira : (a) The Lambeth Conference ; (b) The Conference of the Old Catholics at Hilversum. The Amsterdam Conference. J. Papaioannes : Every, *The Byzantine Patriarchate* (451-1204). Chronicle.

Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift (Vol. XXXIX. No. 1. January-March, 1949. Berne : Stämpfli & Cie). A. Rinkel : Die Lehre von der Kirche nach der Auffassung der altkatholischen Kirche. P. H. Vogel : Die Lambethkonferenz 1948 und die Einheit der Kirche. J. Kalogiru : Das Problem des Humanismus im modernen Orthodoxen Griechenland. B. Spuler : Die Moskaner orthodoxe Kirchenversammlung 1948 und ihre Beschlüsse. Kirchliche Chronik. Reviews.

The International Review of Missions (Vol. XXXVIII. No. 150. April, 1949. London, S.W.1 : 2 Eaton Gate). A. H. Wilkinson : The Bible in the Church. A. J. Appasamy : Christian Theology in India. A. Berthoud : The Birth of a Church : Basutoland. J. J. Considine : Missions of the Catholic Church, 1948. R. Rouse : William Carey's "Pleasing Dream." B. D. Gibson : Am I my Brother's Keeper ? R. Brunner : "Modernism" and "Irreligion" in Judaism To-day. R. Smith : Communism and European Jewry. F. Lake : The Realignment of Medical Missions. H. R. T. Brandreth : Baltby, *The Australian Proposals of Intercommunion*. Right Rev. G. F. Cranswick (Bp. of Tasmania) : Wand, *The Anglican Communion*. R. H. W. Shepherd : Sundkler, *Bantu Prophets in S. Africa*. C. P. Shedd : Rice, *History of the World's Y.W.C.A.* A. Miller : Rouse, *The World's Student Christian Federation*. L. E. Browne : Simon, *Die Welt des Islam*. J. C. McGilvray : Anderson, *The Health of the White Man*. A. W. Power : Burns, *Colour Prejudice*. International Missionary Bibliography (10 pp.).

The English Historical Review (Vol. LXIV. No. 250. January, 1949. Longmans). W. Ullmann : The Development of the Medieval Idea of Sovereignty. M. C. Wren : The Disputed Elections in London in 1641. E. Hughes : Sir Charles Trevelyan and Civil Service Reform 1853-5. Part I. C. E. Stevens : Thomsen, *The Italic Regions*. R. C. Smith : Lot, *L'Art Militaire et les Armées au Moyen Age*. G. Barraclough : Ohnsorge, *Das ZweiKaiser problem im früheren mittelalter*. P. Grierson : Halphen, *Charlemagne et L'Empire carolingien*. C. R. Cheney : Davies, *Episcopal Acts relating to Welsh Dioceses, 1066-1272*, I. T. S. R. Boase : Laurent, *Le Bienheureux Innocent V (Pierre de Tarantaise)*. R. H. Hilton : Boutruche, *Seigneurs et paysans du Bordelais pendant la Guerre de Cent Ans* (4 pp.). G. Davies : Mathew, *The Social Structure in Caroline England* (critical). A. Aspinall : George, *Catalogue of Political . . . Satires in B.M., VIII*. H. H. Bellot : Schlesinger, *The Age of Jackson*. A. J. P. Taylor : Eyck, *Das Persönliche Regiment Wilhelms, II*. E. L. Woodward : Namier, *Diplomatic Prelude, 1938-9*. Livermore, *History of Portugal*. Cross, *Slavic Civilization*. Wood, *History of Nottinghamshire*. Dawes and Baynes, *Three Byzantine Saints*. Bagley, *Margaret of Anjou* (critical). Bourne, *The Anglicanism of William Laud*. Dale, *Fashionable Brighton, 1820-60*. Pimlott, *The Englishman's Holiday*. *Reminiscences of Lord Hardinge of Penshurst* (critical). Rees, *Studies in Welsh History*.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- SHIRLEY, F. J. — *Richard Hooker and Contemporary Political Ideas*, 274 pp. (S.P.C.K.). 14s. 6d.
- MANSON, T. W. — *The Sayings of Jesus*, 347 pp. (S.C.M. Press). 21s.
- BLACKMAN, E. C. — *Marcion and His Influence*, 181 pp. (S.P.C.K.). 12s. 6d.
- MARTENSEN, HANS L. — *Studies in the Life and Teaching of Jacob Boehme* (New Revised Edition translated by T. Rhys Evans), 200 pp. (Rockliff Publishing Corporation). 21s.
- ANSON, HAROLD. — *T. B. Strong*, 140 pp. (S.P.C.K.). 8s. 6d.
- KRAMM, H. H. — *The Theology of Martin Luther*, 152 pp. (James Clarke). 10s. 6d.
- SWEETAPPLE, H. D. S. (Ed. by). — *Parochial Sermons of Bishop Chavasse* (Second Series), 213 pp. (S.P.C.K.). 9s. 6d.
- ACLAND, RICHARD. — *Nothing Left to Believe?* 217 pp. (Longmans). 5s. paper, 8s. 6d. cloth.
- THOMPSON, J. N. — *I Want to Live!* 239 pp. (Mowbray). 6s.
- FORSYTH, P. T. — *Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind*, 258 pp. (Independent Press). 10s. 6d.
- WOOLGAR, J. W. — *This Sacramental Universe*, 201 pp. (James Clarke). 12s. 6d.
- OSBORN, R. R. — *Holy Communion in the Church of England*, 156 pp. (Lutterworth Press). 8s. 6d.
- BURNABY, JOHN. — *Is the Bible Inspired?* 120 pp. (Duckworth). 6s.
- SMITH, J. W. D. — *Introduction to Scripture Teaching*, 152 pp. (Nelson). 6s.
- UNDERHILL, EVELYN (Ed. by Lucy Menzies) — *Shrines and Cities of France and Italy*, 126 pp. (Longmans). 9s. 6d.
- BARNES, E. W. — *Religion Amid Turmoil*, 37 pp. (Cambridge University Press). 1s. 6d.
- KATZ, PETER. — *Nathan Söderblom: A Prophet of Christian Unity*, 95 pp. (James Clarke). 4s. 6d.
- ALLEN, E. L. — *Bishop Grundtvig: A Prophet of the North*, 94 pp. (James Clarke). 4s. 6d.
- Difficulties: Questions on Religion with Answers by Prominent Churchmen*, 163 pp. (Mowbrays). 4s.
- UNDERHILL, EVELYN. — *Meditations and Prayers*, 64 pp. (Longmans). 3s. 6d.
- BENN, ERNEST. — *Happier Days*, 222 pp. (Ernest Benn Ltd.). 8s. 6d.
- IRESON, GORDON W. — *Think Again*, 70 pp. (S.P.C.K.). 2s.
- COOKE, LESLIE E. — *Faith Stakes a Claim*, 171 pp. (Independent Press). 6s.
- MURRAY, JOHN. — *The Bible and our Prayers*, 49 pp. (Independent Press). 4s.
- GUNTRIP, H. — *Psychology for Ministers and Social Workers*, 298 pp. (Independent Press). 8s. 6d.
- JAMESON, JOHN GORDON. — *The Kingdom of Heaven in the Parables*, 113 pp. (William Hodge). 5s.
- PEEL, ALBERT, and DOUGLAS HORTON. — *International Congregationalism*, 117 pp. (Independent Press). 5s.
- KENNEDY, CHARLES W. (Trs. by). — *The Poems of Cynewulf*, 347 pp. (Peter Smith, New York). n.p.

- CARRE, M. H.—*Phases of Thought in England*, 392 pp. (Oxford University Press). 30s.
- MARCEL, GABRIEL.—*Being and Having*, 240 pp. (Dacre Press). 10s. 6d.
- BRABANT, F. H.—*Neville Stuart Talbot, 1879-1943*, 160 pp. (Student Christian Movement Press). 8s. 6d.
- BERDYAEV, NICOLAS.—*The Divine and the Human*, 204 pp. (Geoffrey Bles). 18s.
- BARTH, KARL.—*Dogmatics in Outline*, 155 pp. (Student Christian Movement Press). 12s. 6d.
- FELLOWES, EDMUND H.—*The Office of the Holy Communion as set by John Merbecke*, 42 pp. (Oxford University Press). 21s.
- HAMER, JEROME.—*Karl Barth*, 297 pp. (Desclee de Brouwer, Paris). *n.p.*
- The Bible: A New Translation in Basic English*, 910 pp. (Cambridge University Press). 12s. 6d.
- DON, ALAN CAMPBELL.—*The Scottish Book of Common Prayer 1929*, 52 pp. (S.P.C.K.). 6s. 6d.
- HOBDAV, R. H.—*Does Belief Matter?* 30 pp. (S.P.C.K.). 1s.
- WAYNE, PHILIP (Compiled by).—*School Service*, 216 pp. (Methuen). 3s. 6d. and 4s.
- LANG, L. WYATT.—*The Radiant Orb*, 199 pp. (W. J. Parrett Ltd., Sittingbourne). 12s. 6d.
- COGHILL, NEVILL (Trans. by).—*Visions from Piers Plowman* (Taken from the Poem of William Langland), 143 pp. (Phoenix House). 12s. 6d.
- NORWOOD, C. E.—*The Call*, 112 pp. (Independent Press). 6s.
- DANIELSSON, BROR.—*Studies on the Accentuation of Polysyllabic Latin, Greek and Romance Loan-Words in English*, 650 pp. (Blackwell). 30s.
- ORCIBAL, JEAN.—*Louis XIV Contre Innocent XI*, 107 pp. (J. Vrin, Paris). *n.p.*



INDEX TO VOL. CXLVIII.

- ANGLICAN ORDERS, THE MOSCOW RESOLUTION ON.** Article from a Correspondent, 102.
ARIAN CHRIST, VALENTINUS AND THE. Article by Blair, 1.
ARMINIAN NUNNERY, THE. Article edited by Hussey, 229.
ARNOLD, MATTHEW, ON MILTON. An address by Tillyard, 153.
BERAKAH AND EUCHARISTIA. Article by Richardson, 194.
BIBLICAL THEOLOGY OF ST. IRENAEUS, THE. By Lawson, reviewed, 277.
BURNET, ELIZABETH, 1661-1709. Article by Kirchberger, 17.
CANTERBURY, GIRALDUS CAMBRENSIS AND THE PRIMACY OF. Article by Shaw, 82.
CANTERBURY, THOMAS TENISON, ARCHBISHOP OF. By Carpenter, reviewed, 137.
CATHEDRAL LIBRARY IN THE 17TH CENTURY, AN ENGLISH. Article by Schenk, 72.
CATHEDRALS IN THE MIDDLE AGES, THE ENGLISH SECULAR. By Edwards, reviewed, 135.
CERTAINTY: PHILOSOPHICAL AND THEOLOGICAL. By Trethowan, reviewed, 262.
CO-OPERATION BETWEEN THE MEDICAL PROFESSION AND THE CHURCHES. Article by Ikin, 249.
EUCHARISTIA, BERAKAH AND. Article by Richardson, 194.
EYES OF FAITH: A STUDY IN THE BIBLICAL POINT OF VIEW. By Minear, reviewed, 133.
FAITH, HOW CAME OUR. By Elmslie, reviewed, 131.
GEREE, JOHN—THE CHARACTER OF AN OLD ENGLISH PURITANE, OR NONCONFORMIST. Article edited by Hussey, 65.
GIRALDUS CAMBRENSIS AND THE PRIMACY OF CANTERBURY. Article by Shaw, 82.
GRACE OF HUMILITY, THE. Sermon by Harton, 221.
HOLY TRINITY, THE IMPRESS OF THE. Article by the Bishop of Southampton, 176.
HUMILITY, THE GRACE OF. Sermon by Harton, 221.
IMMINENCE OF THE PAROUSIA, THE. Article by Spencer, 237.
MAN, RECOVERY OF. By Barry, reviewed, 128.
MARCION AND HIS INFLUENCE. By Blackman, reviewed, 276.
MEDICAL PROFESSION AND THE CHURCHES, CO-OPERATION BETWEEN THE. Article by Ikin, 249.
MIDDLE AGES, THE ENGLISH SECULAR CATHEDRALS IN THE. By Edwards, reviewed, 135.
MILTON, MATTHEW ARNOLD ON. Address by Tillyard, 153.
MIRACLE, RELATIVITY AND NATURAL LAW. Article by Jenkins, 52.
MOSCOW RESOLUTION ON ANGLICAN ORDERS, 1948, THE. Article from a Correspondent, 102.
NATURAL LAW, MIRACLE, RELATIVITY AND. Article by Jenkins, 52.
NEWMAN, YOUNG MR. By Ward, reviewed, 142.
NUNNERY, THE ARMINIAN. Article edited by Hussey, 229.
PAROUSIA, THE IMMINENCE OF THE. Article by Spencer, 237.
PRAXEAS, TERTULLIAN'S TREATISE AGAINST—the text edited with an introduction and commentary by Ernest Evans, reviewed, 268.
PURITANE, THE CHARACTER OF AN OLD ENGLISH — JOHN GEREE. Article edited by Hussey, 65.
REASON, THE LIFE OF. By de Burgh, reviewed, 125.
RECOVERY OF MAN. By Barry, reviewed, 128.

RELATIVITY AND NATURAL LAW, MIRACLE. Article by Jenkins, 52.

RELIGION. By Micklem, reviewed, 271.

ST. IRENAEUS, THE BIBLICAL THEOLOGY OF. By Lawson, reviewed, 277.

TENISON, THOMAS, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY, HIS LIFE AND TIMES. By Carpenter, reviewed, 137.

TERTULLIAN'S TREATISE AGAINST PRAXEAS, the text edited with an introduction and commentary by Ernest Evans, reviewed, 268.

UNIVERSITY, THE CRISIS IN THE. By Moberly, reviewed, 258.

VALENTINUS AND THE ARIAN CHRIST. Article by Blair, 1.

WINCHELSEY, ARCHBISHOP—From his election to his enthronement. Article by Graham, 161.

YOUNG MR. NEWMAN. By Ward, reviewed, 142.

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

BARKER, ERNEST. Review: W. Moberly, *The Crisis in the University*, 258.

BLAIR, H. A. Article: *Valentinus and the Arian Christ*, 1.

DAUBNEY, R. H. Reviews: P. S. Minear, *Eyes of Faith: A study in the Biblical Point of View*, 133. Iltyd Trethowan, *Certainty: Philosophical and Theological*, 262.

GRAHAM, R. Article: *Archbishop Winchelsey: From his Election to his Enthronement*, 161.

GREAVES, R. W. Review: E. Carpenter, *Thomas Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury, His Life and Times*, 137.

HARTON, F. P. Sermon: *The Grace of Humility*, 221.

HODGSON, L. Review: W. G. de Burgh, *The Life of Reason*, 125.

HUSSEY, M. Articles: *The Character of an old English Puritane, or Nonconformist—John Gere*, 65. *The Arminian Nunnery*, 229.

IKIN, A. GRAHAM. Article: *Co-operation between the Medical Profession and the Churches*, 249.

JENKINS, H. O. Article: *Miracle, Relativity and Natural Law*, 52.

KIRCHBERGER, C. Article: *Elizabeth Burnet, 1661-1709*, 17.

POTTER, G. R. Review: Kathleen Edwards, *The English Secular Cathedrals in the Middle Ages*, 135.

RICHARDSON, R. D. Article: *Berakah and Eucharistia*, 194.

SCHENK, W. Article: *An English Cathedral Library in the Seventeenth Century*, 72.

SHAW, I. P. Article: *Giraldus Cambrensis and the Primacy of Canterbury*, 82.

SMITH, F. H. Review: N. Micklem, *Religion*, 271.

SOUTHAMPTON, BISHOP OF. Article: *The Impress of the Holy Trinity*, 176.

SPENCER, F. A. M. Article: *The Imminence of the Parousia*, 237.

SUTTON, C. Review: F. R. Barry, *Recovery of Man*, 128.

THOMPSON, J. M. Review: Maisie Ward, *Young Mr. Newman*, 142.

TILLYARD, E. M. W. Sermon: *Matthew Arnold on Milton*, 153.

TURNER, H. E. W. Reviews :
W. A. L. Elmslie, *How Came our Faith*, 131. *Tertullian's Treatise against Praxeas*—the text edited with an introduction and com-

mentary by Ernest Evans, 268.
E. C. Blackman, *Marcion and His Influence*, 276. J. Lawson, *The Biblical Theology of St. Irenaeus*, 277.

AUTHORS REVIEWED

BARRY, F. R. *Recovery of Man*, 128.

BLACKMAN, E. C. *Marcion and his Influence*, 276.

BURGH, W. G. de. *The Life of Reason*, 125.

CARPENTER, E. *Thomas Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury, His Life and Times*, 137.

EDWARDS, K. *The English Secular Cathedrals in the Middle Ages*, 135.

ELMSLIE, W. A. L. *How Came our Faith*, 131.

EVANS, E. *Tertullian's Treatise*

against Praxeas—the text edited with an introduction and commentary, 268.

LAWSON, J. *The Biblical Theology of St. Irenaeus*, 277.

MICKLEM, N. *Religion*, 271.

MINEAR, P. S. *Eyes of Faith: A Study in the Biblical Point of View*, 133.

MOBERLY, W. *The Crisis in the University*, 258

TRETHOWAN, ILLTYD. *Certainty: Philosophical and Theological*, 262.

WARD, M. *Young Mr. Newman*, 142

